4

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES
NO. IV

ST. PAUL'S CONCEPT OF ΙΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ

ACCORDING TO ROM. III, 25

AN HISTORICO-EXEGETICAL INVESTIGATION

Dissertation

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE SACRED SCIENCES AT THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DOCTORATE IN THEOLOGY

BY THE
REV. ROMUALD ALPHONSE MOLLAUN, O.F.M., S.T.L.,
OF THE PROVINCE OF ST. JOHN BAPTIST
CINCINNATI, OHIO

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
WASHINGTON, D. C.
1923

208
C·17

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES
NO. IV

ST. PAUL'S CONCEPT OF ΙΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ

ACCORDING TO ROM. III, 25

AN HISTORICO-EXEGETICAL INVESTIGATION

Dissertation

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE SACRED SCIENCES AT THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DOCTORATE IN THEOLOGY

BY THE
REV. ROMUALD ALPHONSE MOLLAUN, O.F.M., S.T.L.,
OF THE PROVINCE OF ST. JOHN BAPTIST
CINCINNATI, OHIO

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
WASHINGTON, D. C.
1923

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/stpaulsconceptof0000revr

Nihil Obstat.

EDUINUS J. AUWEILER, O. F. M., Ph. D.,
Censor Deputatus.

Imprimi Potest.

EDMUNDUS KLEIN, O. F. M.,
Minister Provincialis.

Nihil Obstat.

HENRICUS SCHUMACHER, S. T. D.,
Censor Deputatus.

Imprimatur.

✠ MICHAEL J. CURLEY, D. D.,
Archiepiscopus Baltimorensis.

200 4d

PREFACE

In Rom. III, 25 St. Paul says of Jesus Christ: ὃν προέθετο ὁ Θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι. What is the meaning of ἱλαστήριον in this important Christological statement? Modern exegetes have sought in vain for a satisfactory answer to this question. As the context shows the term is intimately connected with the doctrines of justification, redemption, atonement, etc., and all these problems have received and are receiving constant attention. Hence, a special treatise on the Pauline ἱλαστήριον is both necessary and opportune. With the hope, therefore, of removing the confusion with which modern exegesis has surrounded the term and of presenting a definite conclusion to the problem, this monograph has been prepared.

To the Rev. Dr. Heinrich Schumacher, Professor of New Testament Exegesis at the Catholic University of America, the author owes a particular indebtedness, and wishes to express to him his acknowledgment for the guiding and helpful service rendered in writing this monograph. He likewise desires to express sincerest gratitude to the Rev. Edwin J. Auweiler, O. F. M., Ph. D., for most valuable suggestions in the presentation of the matter, and to the Rev. Ermin Schneider, O. F. M., for his careful revision of the manuscript.

ROMUALD A. MOLLAUN, O. F. M.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 1

PART I.—HISTORICAL

CHAPTER I. The Text 5

CHAPTER II. History of the Interpretation of ΙΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ. 8

1. In Modern Exegesis 8
2. In the Greek Fathers 25
3. In the Latin Fathers 37
4. In the Exegesis of the Middle Ages down to Modern Times .. 40

PART II.—EXEGETICAL

CHAPTER III. Historico-Literary Investigation of ΙΛΑΣΚΕΣΘΑΙ and its Derivatives.

1. In the Hellenic World 45
2. In the LXX and Jewish Tradition 55
3. In Philo 65
4. In Post-LXX Times 67

CHAPTER IV. Application of the Results to Rom. III, 25 ... 90

CONCLUSION 96

ABBREVIATIONS 99

BIBLIOGRAPHY 101

INTRODUCTION

Ἱλαστήριον in Rom. III, 25 is recognized by modern exegetes as a term of very special importance. Deissmann has well said: "Dass zur Erklärung dieses feierlichen Paulusbekenntnisses keine Vorarbeit zu schwierig und zu genau sein kann, ist gewiss; wir stehen hier vor dem Zentrum der Frömmigkeit des Apostels".[1] The profound difficulties surrounding this famous passage and the painstaking study demanded for its solution explain the wide divergencies among modern authors as to its precise literal meaning. The words of Schweizer may sound exaggerated but an investigation of the history of the problem in recent exegesis will bear out his remark: "Unstreitig ist der Sinn dieser Stelle so schwer auszumitteln, dass kaum je eine Auslegung allgemeine Anerkennung finden dürfte".[2] Even the foremost scholars of the present day confess their inability to grasp and understand St. Paul's concept of ἱλαστήριον. Sanday-Headlam speak of it thus: "Following the example of St. Paul and St. John and the Epistle to the Hebrews we speak of something in this great Sacrifice, which we call 'Propitiation'. We believe that the Holy Spirit spoke through these writers, and that it was His Will that we should use this word. But it is a word which we must leave it to Him to interpret. We drop our plummet into the depth, but the line attached to it is too short, and it does not touch the bottom. The awful processes of the Divine Mind we cannot fathom".[3]

In the face of this discouraging confession an investigation of the problem would seem almost hopeless of results. Yet the extreme difficulty of the question may well arouse interest and the earnest desire for a satisfactory answer, while the importance of ἱλαστήριον for N. T. theology justifies our attempt at a solution in a monograph. Recent research, especially by Deissmann, seems to open new avenues in the right direction and our undertaking is invited by the prospects of a fair measure of success.

[1] ΙΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΣ und ΙΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ, ZntlW (1903), 208-209.
[2] StKr (1858), 466.
[3] Ep. to the Rom., 94.

PART I—HISTORICAL

CHAPTER I

The Text

The Pauline ἱλαστήριον is not a problem of textual criticism but one of historico-exegetical investigation. Hence, at the very outset it is important to note 1) any variants of the text, and 2) to know what meaning the term is given in the versions.

According to Tischendorff[1] the Latin of the bilingual codes Claramontanus (D), Sangermanensis (E), and Boernerianus (G) is "propitiatorem". "Propitiatorem" is also the translation of the Latin patristic writers Ambrosiaster,[2] Pelagius,[3] Ambrose,[4] Jerome,[5] and Orosius.[6] Augustine[7] in two passages, and Rufinus[8] in three places in his recension of Origen's commentary on the Roman epistle, have "propitiatorium". In one place Rufinus[9] has "propitiatorium (sive propitiatorem)". The translation "placationem" is found in Hilary.[10] Most Latin translations follow the Vulgate,[11] which has: "Quem proposuit Deus propitiationem per fidem in sanguine ipsius". However, we learn from Tischendorff[12] that the Vulgate code Harleianus ** (harl) reads "propitiatorem".

Right here we are presented with four different renderings in the Latin. More varied and even surprising translations occur in other versions.

A quite unusual reading is offered by the Bohairic: "Whom God before set as a *forgiver* (ⲟⲩⲣⲉϥϫⲱ) through (the) faith in his blood";[13] the Sahidic[14] on the other hand gives ἱλαστήριον an abstract meaning: "This (one) whom God put aforetime for *forgiveness* (ⲛ̄ⲕⲱ) through the faith in his blood." The editors of the Sahidic version inform us that the Syriac, Armenian, and

[1] Novum Testamentum Graece, II, 378, Lipsiae, 1872.
[2] MPL, 17, 80.
[3] MPL, 30, 661.
[4] MPL, 14, 577.
[5] MPL, 23, 506.
[6] MPL, 31, 1188.
[7] MPL, 44, 133 and 213.
[8] MPG, 14, 947, 949, 950.
[9] MPG, 14, 946.
[10] MPL, 9, 415.
[11] Vogels, Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine, Düsseldorf, 1922.
[12] Op. cit., 378.
[13] Horner, Coptic Version of the N. T. (Northern Dialect), III, 22.
[14] Coptic Version of the N. T. (Southern Dialect), IV, 32.

Ethiopic versions read: "For put him God, and made him an *atonement* for faith in his blood"; while the Ethiopic ro has: "For because of him he gave to us his *mercy* in faith".[15] The Arabic[16] retains the reading "propitiatorium": "Quem Deus praeconstituit propitiatorium per fidem, interveniente ipsius sanguine".

With such an assortment of meanings to select from, we need not be at all astonished to find all early authorities for the English translation at variance in interpreting ἱλαστήριον in Rom. III, 25. Wiclif[17] translates: "Whom God ordeynde *forghyvere* bi feith in his blood". Tyndale[18] prefers: "Whom God hath made a *seate of mercy* thorow faith in his bloud". Cranmer[19] reads: "Whom God hath set forth to be the *obtayner of mercy* thorow fayth, by the meanes of hys bloude". The Geneva Edition[20] chooses the abstract meaning: "Whom God hath set forthe to be a *pacification* through faith in his bloude". Later and modern editions generally affect *propitiation*, the Revised Version[21] having on the margin "to be propitiatory". But the Twentieth Century N. T.[22] has: "For God set him before the world, to be, by the shedding of his blood, a *means of reconciliation* through faith".

Neither do we find a uniform rendering in the German. According to the Lutheran bible the passage means: "Welchen Gott hat vorgestellt zu einem *Gnadenstuhl*, durch den Glauben in seinem Blut".[23] Cartier[24] who translates from the Vulgate has: "Welchen Gott zur *Aussöhnung* durch den Glauben in seinem Blut vorgestellt hat", and Arndt[25] who also bases his translation on the Vulgate chooses: "Welchen Gott dargestellt hat als *Sühne* durch den Glauben in seinem Blute". Jaeck[26] and Allioli[27] also

[15] Op. cit., 33.

[16] Waltonus, Biblia Polyglotta, V, 645, London, 1657.

[17] The New Testament translated from the Latin in the year 1380 by J. Wiclif, London, 1810.

[18] The New Testament of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, published in 1526, London, 1836.

[19] The English Hexapla, London, 1846. [20] The English Hexapla.

[21] The Holy Bible, Two Version Edition, 1244-1245, Oxford, 1899.

[22] Twentieth Century New Testament, a translation from the original Greek, 355, New York, 1904.

[23] Die Bibel nach der deutschen Uebersetzung Martin Luther's, 128, Cöln, 1876.

[24] Biblia Sacra Latino-Germanica, IV, 303, Constantiae, 1763.

[25] Das Neue Testament, 116, Regensburg, 1903.

[26] Die Heilige Schrift, 189, Leipzig, 1866.

[27] Die Heilige Schrift, 160, New York, 1894.

follow the Vulgate, yet their translations differ. While the former has: "Welchen Gott zum *Versöhnungs-Opfer* durch den Glauben an sein Blut bestimmt hat", the latter gives just the opposite: "Welchen Gott dargestellt hat als *Sühnopfer* durch den Glauben in seinem Blute".

This short survey of ἱλαστήριον in Rom. III, 25 is evidence enough to show that translators had difficulty with the word. Apart from the fact that it demonstrates the urgent need of a special and careful investigation, it leaves the impression that St. Paul's concept of the term was manifestly more comprehensive than is generally believed. Undoubtedly every translator strove to give ἱλαστήριον that one particular content which, in his opinion, would best express its application to Christ. Quite a variety of readings result, and we find expressed the ideas of expiation, propitiation, reconciliation, forgiveness, mercy, and sacrifice. It needs no proof to show that all these elements may have reference to Christ in His sacrifice. This permits the assertion that this single word contains more than one element. It will be well, then, to bear this in mind when dealing with the history of the interpretation of St. Paul's ἱλαστήριον, which will be taken up in the next chapter, and especially when making the literary investigation.

CHAPTER II

History of the Interpretation of ΙΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ in Rom. III, 25

1. IN MODERN EXEGESIS

The large number of commentators who discuss the meaning of *ἱλαστήριον* in Rom. III, 25 makes it impossible to quote them all at great length. Therefore, in order to describe briefly the modern history of the problem, the authors have been grouped around the several, general views proposed as possible explanations. Let it be added, however, that, even though the interpretations may be put into general classes, it is no easy matter to subdivide them, because the various theories and methods of explanation are often intermingled. Doubtless it will be best to let the individual authors speak for themselves; for the sake of brevity, that only will be quoted which is considered necessary to convey their acceptation of the term.

I. The O. T. Propitiatory or Mercy-Seat the Type; Jesus Christ the Anti-Type

The most prominent opinion among moderns is that *ἱλαστήριον* in Rom. III, 25 must be interpreted in the light of O. T. usage. Forbes justly remarks that to assign to the term any other meaning than that which St. Paul knew every reader of the O. T. must attach to it, "seems almost equivalent to saying that he wrote to be misunderstood, or was incompetent to select a fit expression to render his meaning clear and unambiguous".[1] The majority of modern scholars maintain, therefore, that the Pauline term is an allusion to the כַּפֹּרֶת in the Holy of Holies, which Hebrew word the LXX rendered by *ἱλαστήριον*.

The כַּפֹּרֶת, as it is described in Ex. XXV, 17-23, was a slab of solid gold, distinct from the ark of the covenant. It was 2½ cubits long and 1½ cubits wide and corresponded exactly with the measurements of the ark over which it was placed. From opposite ends

[1] Comm. on Rom., 166.

of the propitiatory [2] rose a pair of golden cherubim. Their faces were bent downwards in the direction of the propitiatory, while the wings with which each was furnished met overhead, so as to cover the propitiatory.[3] Under their extended wings Jahveh had His peculiar dwelling place. On the day of Atonement the High Priest sprinkled the propitiatory seven times with the blood of the sin-offering as an act of expiation and propitiation (Lev. XVI, 19). St. Paul then, these authors say, in his Roman epistle designates Christ as the antitype of the O. T. ἱλαστήριον and as the reality of all that it symbolized.

A. *With Reference to the Sacrifice of Christ.*

1. The *blood-sprinkled* propitiatory or mercy-seat typical of Christ *blood-sprinkled* in His Sacrifice.

As a general rule modern exegetes regard כַּפֹּרֶת as a derivative of the Piel form כִּפֶּר which means 'to expiate, to propitiate, to atone' and "is the technical term in the Mosaic ritual, for the object and intent of sacrifice".[4] This leads some moderns to see in the blood-sprinkled propitiatory on the Atonement day a type of the bloody sacrifice of Christ. "The tertium comparationis", as Philippi [5] puts it, "is simply this, that Christ, sprinkled with blood, resembles the Kapporeth sprinkled with blood", and the Pauline word therefore "retains its historically fixed reference to the Kapporeth as the means of expiation κατ' ἐξοχήν". According to Belsham [6] Christ is the N. T. mercy-seat "sprinkled and consecrated by his own blood, as that of old was by the blood of the appointed victim". Comparison of the sacrifice of Christ to the

[2] The translation "propitiatory" is the adoption of "propitiatorium" of the Latin versions, while the term "mercy-seat" came through the "Gnadenstuhl" of Luther's translation and the "seat of mercy" of Tyndale. Commentators have accepted the terms propitiatory or mercy-seat and use the two indiscriminately when referring to the O. T. כַּפֹּרֶת.

[3] The question concerning the detailed construction and minor purposes of the O. T. propitiatory is much disputed. It is irrelevant to our investigation. For particulars see discussions of Tostatus, Opera, 39-41; Corn. a Lapide, Comm. in S. S., I, 639-641; Dibellius, Die Lade Jahves, 38 ff.; Orfali, Arca Foederis, 29-31; Salianus, Epitome, 232 ff., and Commentaries on Ex. XXV, 17.

[4] Lange, Comm. on H. Scrip., V, 132-133.

[5] Comm. on Rom., 144-145.

[6] Epistles of Paul, I, 76.

blood-sprinkled propitiatory suggests, in the opinion of Briggs,[7] "the application of his blood . . . to the propitiatory in accordance with the ritual of the day of Atonement"; and "the Messiah is thus the blood-sprinkled propitiatory". Priestley[8] selects the meaning propitiatory because it shows Christ in His sacrifice as the N. T. reality; and, as the O. T. propitiatory was sprinkled with blood once a year, so now "the apostle, by way of figure, represents his blood as sprinkled upon it". Zeller[9] sees in Christ the antitypical propitiatory "der besprengt mit dem eigenen Blut . . . die Sühne wirklich und allgemein leistet, welche das A. T. vorgebildet hatte". According to Whitby[10] the mercy-seat in the Holy of Holies was styled ἱλαστήριον, "because it was the place where God promised to be propitious". Applying the term to Christ: as those under the O. T., who desired to have God propitious to them, were to come with the blood of their sin-offering to the propitiatory, "so under the gospel dispensation they must expect to find God propitious to them, through the blood of Christ, their mercy-seat". Weidner[11] sees in Christ as our High Priest and Sacrifice, "sprinkled with His own blood, . . . that which the cover, or kapporeth, or 'mercy-seat' had been typically". In the opinion of Plumer[12] St. Paul's ἱλαστήριον is "borrowed from the Septuagint version of the Old Testament", and, "as the Israelites obtained pardon and acceptance as public worshipers by the sprinkling of blood on the mercy-seat, so eternal life is dispensed from Christ". Scofield[13] writes that in fulfilment of the O. T. type "Christ is Himself the hilasmos, 'that which propitiates,' and the hilasterion, 'the place of propitiation'—the mercy-seat sprinkled with His own blood". Tholuck[14] argues that as Christ is represented in the N. T. both as High Priest and as victim, "so konnte auch im A. B. nicht nur das dargebrachte Opfer als Bild Christi betrachtet werden, sondern auch der mit dem versöhnenden Blute besprengte Gnadenstuhl". That Christ in His own blood became the N. T. reality of the O. T. blood-sprinkled propitiatory is also the view of Pool,[15] Kneeland,[16] and Gaebelein.[17]

[7] Messias of the Apostles, 147-148.
[8] Notes on Scripture, IV, 275.
[9] Bibl. Handwörterbuch, 248.
[10] Comm. on O. and N. T., IV, 543-544.
[11] Bibl. Theology of N. T., II, 134.
[12] Comm. on Rom., 132-133.
[13] N. T. and Psalms, 203.
[14] Brief an d. Röm., 123.
[15] Annotations upon the Bible, III, 489.
[16] N. T. in Greek and English, II, 110.
[17] Ep. to the Rom., 24.

2. The Propitiatory as *Medium of Mercy, Pardon, and Forgiveness,* a Type of Christ.

On the Atonement day the High Priest sprinkled the propitiatory with the blood of the sin-offering to obtain forgiveness and pardon for sins and the mercy of God. Hence some commentators emphasize the rendition of the Pauline word as *mercy-seat,* to show that Christ through His Sacrifice procured for mankind forgiveness and pardon for sins and the mercy of God. These scholars find the relation between the O. T. mercy-seat and Christ not so much in the sacrifice itself, as in the effects produced by that sacrifice.

Thus Sheldon[18] thinks that reference to the terminology of the LXX version and to patristic interpretation "would dictate a preference for the expression 'mercy-seat'". If the O. T. mercy-seat was only a type, as Lechner[19] believes, "so zeigt hier der Apostel, dass Christus der wahre Gnadenstuhl sei, durch welchen Allen vollkommene Vergebung zu Theil werde". The ἱλαστήριον in the Holy of Holies, to speak with Olshausen,[20] represented itself to the Israelites "as the place from which the forgiveness of their sins proceeded". And now Christ as the N. T. reality is solemnly presented in His sacrifice to all peoples "in order that they may receive forgiveness of sins through his blood". John Brown[21] writes that the Pauline term designates Christ as "the true mercy-seat, in whom we may see God fully reconciled to us". In much the same way Trollope,[22] Bosanquet,[23] and Storrer[24] refer the Pauline word to Christ as the true mercy-seat. According to Otto[25] the typical mercy-seat stood behind the veil within the Holy of Holies; its antitype, however, "der wahre Gnadenstuhl ist durch Zerreissung des Vorhanges seines Fleisches vor Augen gestellt".

3. The Propitiatory as Manifestation of the *Divine Presence,* a type of Christ.

Besides being the medium of forgiveness, pardon, and mercy the propitiatory served also as the centre of the divine presence and manifestation (Ex. xxv, 22; Lev. xvi, 2). Accordingly some

[18] N. T. Theology, 230.
[19] Hl. Schrift d. N. T., 621.
[20] Comm. on N. T., III, 546.
[21] Exposition of Rom., 113.
[22] Analecta Theol., II, 336.
[23] Paraphrase on Rom., 43.
[24] Brief an d. Röm., 23.
[25] Brief an d. Röm., 74.

authors find in the Pauline ἱλαστήριον a similar representation without, however, excluding the notion of sacrifice.

Concerning the propitiatory in the Holy of Holies Ritschl says it signified "das höchste Symbol göttlicher Gegenwart in der Israelitischen Gemeinde".[26] "Paulus konnte nun die Qualität Jesu mit dem Ausdrucke bezeichnen", he continues, "der jeden Israeliten an die Gnadengegenwart Gottes erinnerte".[27] For Ritschl then ἱλαστήριον denotes properly a divine representation. Similarly Bleibtreu: "Dort war er mit seiner Herrlichkeit und Gnadenmacht unter Israel gegenwärtig".[28] But the O. T. ἱλαστήριον also served another purpose: "Als Sühnort ist die Kapporeth blutbesprengt und in der gleichen Eigenschaft des Sühnortes wird sie dann weiter auch das, wozu sie von Gott in Aussicht genommen ist, nämlich die Stätte seiner Gegenwart".[29] The Pauline term in its application to Christ, according to Bleibtreu, has then the following signification: "Dass für die Gemeinde des Neuen Testamentes Christus Jesus der Ort sei, da in entsprechender Weise Gottes gnadenvolle Herrlichkeit strahlt, ist . . . ein ebenso wahrer als einfacher Gedanke".[30] From these quotations it is seen that Bleibtreu does not find in ἱλαστήριον the elements of expiation or propitiation. These are added "durch die beigefügten Worte, ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι"[31] which, he adds, clearly refer to a sacrifice. Therefore he states that ἱλαστήριον "keinesfalls eine Sühne oder ein Sühnopfer bezeichnen muss", but "dass in dem Ausdrucke nothwendigerweise eine Vertretung Gottes uns gegenüber liegt".[32] Like Ritschl, Bleibtreu thinks that ἱλαστήριον primarily means the manifestation of the divine presence.

Ἱλαστήριον, according to Vaughan,[33] is properly the neuter of the adjective and means "propitiatory or expiatory". And the O. T. type, when sprinkled with blood, "became the symbolic centre of the personal hope of mercy, as well as the Divine Presence in Israel"; the application of the word to Christ "constitutes Him as it were the mercy-seat of the new temple in which God dwells with redeemed man". Gifford,[34] interpreting the Pauline term as "mercy-seat", explains that as the O. T. ἱλαστήριον "was the cen-

[26] Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung, II, 168.
[27] Op. cit., 170.
[28] StKr (1883), 559.
[29] Op. cit., 561.
[30] Op. cit., 559.
[31] Ibid.
[32] Op. cit., 560.
[33] Ep. to the Rom., 73-74.
[34] Comm. on Rom., 96.

tral point of the divine presence and manifestation, the place of meeting and communion, between God and the representative of his people", so now "in Christ the full manifestation of God to man is made". Livermore[35] too writes that Christ is now the mercy-seat, "the bright and holy place of the Divine presence and glory shining in his face". The propitiatory in the O. T., Paige[36] opines, "was the place where the divine presence was specially manifested, and where the divine goodness was proclaimed". And in applying the term to Christ St. Paul designates Him as the N. T. mercy-seat "because he was the brightness of his Father's glory, and the express image of his person (Hebr. I, 3), thus manifesting the divine presence".

4. The Propitiatory as Medium of *Communication* and *Meeting* with God, a Type of Christ.

We read in Num. VII, 89 that Moses communicated with Jahveh through the medium of the propitiatory. Wherefore some exegetes see in St. Paul's use of ἱλαστήριον a similar signification.

The O. T. mercy-seat, Vincent[37] remarks, "was the meeting-place of God and man"; "the place of mediation and manifestation". In the N. T., through Jesus Christ, "the antitype of the mercy-seat, the Mediator, man has access to the Father (Eph. II, 18)". And Christ as antitype "is now brought out where all can draw nigh and experience its reconciling power". When Christ is compared to the mercy-seat of the O. T., the idea naturally conveyed to the Jewish mind would be "that through him God meets with us, forgiving our sins, and communing with us"; in other words, St. Paul meant to say that "God has himself set forth this victim, Jesus, as a mercy-seat, where he will meet you" (J. Clarke).[38] "What in the Jewish ritual the bloody sacrifices were, that in Paul's apprehension the life, sufferings and death of Christ are in Christianity". Now in the Hebrew system "there was a Mercy-Seat where God met humanity"; in the Christian system God "hath set forth before all the people Jesus Christ his Son, as a Mercy-Seat" (Abbot).[39]

[35] Ep. to the Rom., 114.
[36] Comm. on N. T., IV, 82.
[37] Word Studies, III, 46-47.
[38] Ideas of Paul, 308.
[39] Ep. to the Rom., 121.

5. The Propitiatory as a *Cover* of expiation-propitiation, a Type of Christ.

Some authors, basing their arguments upon Ex. xxv, 20, hold that the כַּפֹּרֶת served as the immediate cover for the ark of the covenant.[40] They derive כַּפֹּרֶת from the Kal form כָּפַר whose primary root meaning,[41] they say, is 'to cover' and, in combination with the sacrificial ritual of the Atonement day, they conclude for the meaning of cover of expiation or propitiation. In Rom. III, 25 *ἱλαστήριον* would then refer to Christ as the N. T. expiatory or propitiatory cover.

Hence Cremer[42] observes that the O. T. כַּפֹּרֶת had as object "die sühnende Bedeckung der Bundeslade mit dem Gesetze darin". What St. Paul wishes to say in Rom. III, 25 is that God gave Christ to us "zur sühnenden Bedeckung", which evidently means that Christ in His sacrifice covered the sins of man before God. Weber[43] is of opinion that the כַּפֹּרֶת in the Holy of Holies served "als ein Sühngeräthe" and it is such "insofern sie eben das Gesetz, das wider Israel spricht, vor Jehova zudeckt". St. Paul, he goes on to say, compares Christ to this instrument of atonement, and Christ is our *ἱλαστήριον ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι*, "und diese Verbindung erinnert an das gesetzliche Sühnung der Sünde durch das blutige Opfer". Seeberg[44] assures us that the כַּפֹּרֶת is called *ἱλαστήριον* "weil er der Deckung dessen dient, angesichts dessen Gott dem sündigen Volk hätte zürnen müssen", i. e., the ark containing the law, for "durch Deckung des Gesetzes ist auch die

[40] Dillman, Ex. und Lev., 313, Nowack, Lehrbuch d. hebr. Archäologie, II, 60 and others say the ark had a cover of its own and that the כַּפֹּרֶת was a kind of sheltering roof (Schutzdach).

[41] The primary root meaning of כָּפַר is disputed. Lexicons usually give 'to cover, to overlay'; cf. Gesenius, Thesaurus, II, 708, König, Lehrgebäude d. hebr. Sprache, II, 201 and ExpT (1911), 378-380, where he defends this interpretation. On the other hand, Langdon, ExpT (1911), 320-325, and others, say it means 'to remove, to wipe away.' Driver, ERE, V, 654, 2, says the meaning is still uncertain; F. Brown, Hebrew-English Lexicon, 497, writes that the original meaning is doubtful, but that it most probably is to cover.

[42] Wörterbuch d. neut. Gräcität, 509-510.

[43] Vom Zorne Gottes, 273-274.

[44] Der Tod Christi, 184-185.

Sünde zugedeckt". St. Paul, in Rom. III, 25, has in mind the circumstances of "eine Deckung", which apparently means that by His sacrifice Christ covered the sins of mankind.

B. *Without Reference to the Sacrifice of Christ.*

Mention must be made of some few authors who interpret the Pauline ἱλαστήριον as designating Christ the antitype of the O. T. type, but who fail to find in the term any direct or indirect reference to the sacrifice of Christ.

Thus Jacobs[45] thinks that when St. Paul employs the word ἱλαστήριον, he means to say that "in Christ all that is fulfilled which the Mercy Seat had foreshadowed". The term has no reference to sacrifice but has inherent in it the idea "of the covering of sins" made at the mercy-seat. In Rom. III, 25 Christ as the fulfilment must, then, be styled the N. T. cover for sin. To Agus[46] the word represents Christ protecting and directing His church. As the propitiatory was placed over the ark as a protection and as from there Jahveh spoke to His people and directed them, "sic Christus est super Ecclesiam, et ipsam protegit et Deum nobis propitium reddit et Ecclesiam totam instituit et gubernat". Macknight[47] and Bree[48] see in the Pauline word, Christ the antitype of the O. T. mercy-seat "set forth by God for receiving the worship of men and dispensing pardon to them". Taylor[49] interprets it as designating Christ, the true mercy-seat, because He is "the Foundation . . . upon which we present all our Services and Devotions to him, in Hopes of Pardon and Acceptance".

According to Drummond[50] the Pauline term is best explained "when we understand that Christ stands to the Christian in the same relation as the mercy-seat to the ancient Hebrew". The Hebrews regarded the mercy-seat "as the place where God made Himself known to Moses, and communed with him" and "in this sense also the figure would be applicable to Christ". Hobart[51] discards all views that express a relation to the sacrifice of Christ and prefers "propitiation to mean the meeting-place for men and God". Newcome[52] would have it represent Christ "as the mes-

[45] Annotations on Rom., 70-71.
[46] Ep. ad Rom., 192.
[47] Apost. Epistles, I, 72.
[48] Study of H. Scripture, II, 117.
[49] Paraphrase on Rom., 269.
[50] Ep. to the Rom., 281.
[51] Expositions in Rom., 43.
[52] The New Testament, 349.

senger of divine mercy, and the medium of divine communications to mankind".

II. ΙΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ: Christ the Expiator-Propitiator

A second group of commentators contend that ἱλαστήριον in Rom. III, 25 means that Christ in His sacrifice became the expiator or propitiator for the sins of the world. Few are the modern exegetes who venture this opinion.

Rosenmuller[53] arrives at this conclusion by a comparative study of nouns ending in (τ)ήριον and tracing their derivation to verbs. Such nouns generally indicate "id quod habet vim aliquid efficiendi, ut σωτήριον—vim servandi". He concludes that the Pauline term means "expiatorem, eum qui habet vim expiandi". Bretschneider[54] renders ἱλαστήριον "vim expiandi habens"; applying this to Rom. III, 25 he sees in it Christ the "expiationis auctor". Holden[55] explains it as meaning "a propitiator," as does Robinson[56] who, in reference to Rom. III, 25, contends that it means "a propitiator, one who makes propitiation".

III. ΙΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ: The Expiatory-Propitiatory Sacrifice of Christ

Another group of modern scholars propose what they believe to be a more plausible explanation, which has in the N. T., they maintain, the analogy of doctrine more decidedly in its favor.[57] They all agree that ἱλαστήριον in Rom. III, 25 has some relation to the sacrifice of Christ, yet they are at a loss as to whether the meaning is expiatory or propitiatory or both, and they arrive at their conclusions by various methods of investigation.

1. Some seek the solution of the problem in the symbolical *sacrifices of the O. T.* which were so many types of the sacrifice of Christ. MacGarvey-Pendleton[58] state St. Paul "makes it apparent that the sacrifices of the Old Testament were types", because they foreshadowed "Christ, the real propitiatory sacrifice". Cornely[59] thinks of "vel piaculum in genere vel rectius sacrifi-

[53] Scholia in N. T., III, 581.
[54] Lexicon Graeco-Lat. N. T., I, 586.
[55] Christian Expositor, II, 355.
[56] Greek-Eng. Lexicon of N. T., 387.
[57] Cf. Jn. I, 29; Eph. V, 2; Hebr. IX, 24; I Peter I, 19 and II, 24.
[58] Thess., Cor., Gal., and Rom., 321.
[59] Comm. ad Rom., 190.

cium piaculare seu propitiatorium" and cites as authority St. John Chrysostom who, according to him, contrasts Christ's sacrifice to the "sacrificiis propitiatoriis veteris oeconomiae". Guyse[60] and Schaff[61] similarly appeal to the O. T. sacrificial types in supporting "propitiatory sacrifice".

2. Others deduce the meaning expiatory-propitiatory sacrifice by comparing the sacrifice of Christ to the *sacrificial blood sprinkled on the propitiatory.* Funke denies that sin was expiated by the sprinkling of blood on the propitiatory but "nur einstweilen bis auf das vollkommene Sühnopfer, welches ist Christus, bedeckt wurde".[62] Therefore by the sacrifice of Christ sin was covered not only for a time, "sondern wirklich für immer bedeckt".[63] He concludes that in Rom. III, 25 ἱλαστήριον means "das wahre Sühnopfer".[64] Krüger[65] has "Sühnopfer, wobei vielfach an das Opfer des Versöhnungstages gedacht wird und an die Kapporeth". Henry,[66] who also refers to Christ as the antitype of the O. T. propitiatory, selects the meaning "propitiatory sacrifice".

3. Then there are commentators who insist quite as strongly that the *context* in Rom. III, 25 demands the rendition of expiatory-propitiatory sacrifice. It is certain, says Rückert,[67] "dass Paulus Christum als denjenigen denke, durch welchen die Sühnung der menschlichen Sünde zu Stande komme". And it is probable "dass er ihn als Solchen unter dem Bilde eines Sühnopfers darstellen wolle", for which interpretation "ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι zu sprechen scheint". Beck,[68] who holds that ἱλαστήριον in general means "etwas was Sühn-Kraft hat oder zur Sühnung dient", has this to say of the Pauline use of the term: "Namentlich weisst unser ganzer Context, indem darin ἀπολυτρώσεως (v. 24), αἷμα, πάρεσις τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων zur Sprache kommt, auf den Begriff eines Sühnenden Opfers". Baur,[69] Reischl,[70] Gurlitt,[71] and Jülicher[72] decide for the meaning "Sühnopfer" because of the word ἀπολύτρωσις in v. 24, which shows, they say, that the sacrifice of Christ was primarily one of expiation. Kahnis,[73] commenting on Rom. III, 25, explains that Christ's sacrifice delivered men "von

[60] Practical Expositor, III, 381.
[61] Popular Comm. on N. T., III, 46.
[62] StKr (1842), 314.
[63] Op. cit., 315.
[64] Op. cit., 320.
[65] Rechtfertigung n. Röm., 204.
[66] Exposition of O. and N. T., IX, 25.
[67] Brief an d. Röm., I, 173.
[68] Brief an d. Röm., 307-308.
[69] Paulus, 539.
[70] Hl. Schrift d. N. T., 611.
[71] StKr (1840), 977.
[72] Schriften d. N. T., II, 239.
[73] Lutherische Dogmatik, I, 584.

der Knechtschaft der Sünde (ἀπολύτρωσι), zerreisst den Schuldbrief der gegen sie zeugte (Kol. 2, 14), bedeckt die Gott und Menschen trennende Sünde als Sühnopfer (ἱλαστήριον)". David Brown,[74] Connybeare-Howson,[75] Schedd,[76] and Stuart[77] consider the context of Rom. III, 25, especially the phrase ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι, sufficient evidence for the meaning "propitiatory sacrifice". According to Weinel,[78] if we try to imagine here "a concrete instance of the abstract noun 'propitiation', it must be confessed that the idea of sacrifice is the most natural". Therefore he stands for the meaning of propitiatory sacrifice as also does Rashdall[79] who discusses the term at some length.

Morison concludes that ἱλαστήριον was employed by St. Paul as an adjective "retaining its primary adjectival import and force" with the meaning "propitiatory".[80] He admits that "in substance at least", propitiatory sacrifice is "the correct interpretation of the Apostle's expression", because "if Jesus was 'propitiatory' at all, he was propitiatory as a sacrifice".[81] That such an idea was present to the Apostle's mind "is put beyond all reasonable question by the very next words, 'through faith in his blood'".[82] Although Sanday-Headlam say that ἱλαστήριον as substantive strictly means "place or vehicle of propitiation",[83] they prefer to take it in Rom. III, 25 "as adj. accus. masc. added as predicate to ὃν".[84] That they admit the presence of the element of sacrifice in the term, is evident from the following: "It is impossible to get rid from this passage of the double idea (1) of a sacrifice; (2) of a sacrifice which is propitiatory. In any case the phrase ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι carries with it the idea of sacrificial bloodshedding".[85] Whatever sense we assign to ἱλαστήριον, "the fundamental idea which underlies the word must be that of propitiation".[86] This is also the opinion of Knight;[87] the term should "simply be rendered propitiatory, and regarded as qualifying ὃν". So also Denney[88] who takes the word as predicate to

[74] Ep. to the Rom., 36.
[75] Life and Ep. of Paul, II, 167.
[76] Comm. on Rom., 81.
[77] Comm. on Rom., 152-153.
[78] St. Paul, 307.
[79] Atonement in Christ. Theology, 131-132.
[80] Exposition of the III chapter of Rom., 303.
[81] Op. cit., 304.
[82] Op. cit., 295.
[83] Op. cit., 87.
[84] Op. cit., 88.
[85] Op. cit., 91.
[86] Ibid.
[87] Comm. on Rom., 179.
[88] Expositor's Gr. Test., II, 611.

ὄν, meaning that "Christ is conceived with propitiatory power, in virtue of His death".

4. Several exegetes arrive at the meaning expiatory-propitiatory sacrifice by comparing ἱλαστήριον with *analogous words* ending in (τ)ήριον. Meyer [89] starts out by saying that in general terminology it means "expiatorium ohne dass im Worte selbst schon die nähere Sinnbestimmung gegeben ist". Then, in the light of such words as καθαρτήριον, σωτήριον, εὐχαριστήριον, χαριστήριον, etc., which are found in the classics, he interprets the Pauline word as "Sühnopfer" with the remark that the phrase "in His blood" renders "die Vorstellung von einem sühnenden Opfer klar genug". Bisping [90] gives the adjective the meaning "sühnend, versöhnend". He then cites καθάρσιον and χαριστήριον as proof for his contention that the substantive in Rom. III, 25 means "Sühnopfer"; this interpretation "passt . . . am schönsten zu dem προέθετο und dem ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι: als ein blutiges Sühnopfer hat Gott Christum öffentlich dargestellt". Thayer [91] defines the adjective thus: "relating to appeasing or expiating, having placating or expiatory force, expiatory". Quoting the same analogies as Meyer he translates the Pauline substantive as "an expiatory sacrifice; a piacular victim". DeWette [92] and Hodge [93] also appeal to similar analogies taken from profane Greek, but while the former selects the translation "Sühnopfer", the latter chooses "propitiatory sacrifice".

5. Within the category of expiatory-propitiatory sacrifice must be placed the interpretation of some who would render the Pauline term as expiatory-propitiatory *offering*. Thus Lightfoot [94] thinks that ἱλαστήριον must be interpreted as "a propitiatory offering" and quotes as confirmation διαβατήριον, νικητήριον, and the parallels mentioned by Meyer and others. Similarly Gray,[95] Winer,[96] Stifler,[97] and Alford [98] explain the word as meaning "propitiatory offering" and Cowles [99] understands it as "a propitiatory offering of a sacrificial nature". On the other hand Moule has "a price of expiation" [100] and "an expiatory offering".[101] Ripley [102]

[89] Brief an d. Röm., 141.
[90] Brief an d. Röm., 141-142.
[91] Greek-Eng. Lexicon of N. T., 301.
[92] Brief an d. Röm., 45.
[93] Comm. on Rom., 83.
[94] Notes on Ep. of Paul, 271.
[95] Biblical Museum, II, 23.
[96] Grammar of N. T., Diction, 108.
[97] Ep. to the Rom., 60.
[98] Greek Test., II, 343.
[99] Longer Ep. of Paul, 37.
[100] Ep. to the Rom. (Expositor's Bible), 93.
[101] Ep. to the Rom. (Cambridge Bible), 85.
[102] Ep. to the Rom., 39.

paraphrases the term as "a propitiatory offering, an expiatory victim" and Bruston,[103] in reference to Rom. III, 25, holds that it does not signify always a propitiatory victim, but rather "une offrande (*ἀνάθημα*) propitiatoire ou expiatoire, offerte à la Divinité". Godwin[104] renders the word "mercy-offering" and Chalmers[105] thinks it rather "signifies the offering itself, than the place in which the offering was sprinkled". Platt[106] says "the most natural", and "the only meaning suitable to the context" is "a propitiatory offering—a means of rendering God consistently favorable towards sinful men and the means of reconciliation between God and man".

6. Finally there are those who designate the sacrifice of Christ as expiatory-propitiatory, in which case Christ Himself as *ἱλαστήριον* may be styled an expiatory-propitiatory *victim*. So Beelen[107] believes that it signifies "victimam piacularem" and the same interpretation is given by Wahl[108] and Zorrell.[109] For Bernardinus a Piconio[110] the word describes Christ as a "victima propitians"; so also MacEvilly.[111] Wordsworth[112] argues for "Sin-Offering, or Propitiatory Victim", Schleusner[113] for "Victima expiatoria" and Grimm[114] for "sacrificium expiatorium, victima piacularis".

IV. ΙΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ: Expiation-Propitiation

A few exegetes decide for the abstract meaning *expiation* or *propitiation*. According to Schaefer[115] the adjective signifies "versöhnend oder sühnend". After examining other proposed interpretations for the substantive in Rom. III, 25 he concludes as follows: "Darum erscheint jene Erklärung als die vorzüglichere, die mit der Vulgata allgemein an 'Sühne oder Söhnung' . . . denkt". Jowett[116], maintaining that the term is to be explained like *σωτήριον* in Ex. XX, 24, translates it "propitiation" and this is also the meaning assigned to the word by Wardlaw.[117] Miller[118] widens the idea contained in the word to "any certain

[103] ZntlW (1906), 77.
[104] Ep. to the Rom., 90.
[105] Lectures on Rom., 59.
[106] DAC, II, 283, art. Propitiation.
[107] Comm. in Rom., 59.
[108] Clavis N. T., I, 238.
[109] N. T. Lexicon Graec., 262.
[110] Ep. Pauli Expositio, I, 38.
[111] Exposition of Ep. of Paul, I, 29.
[112] N. T. in Greek, 217.
[113] Lexicon Graeco-Lat. in N. T., I, 850.
[114] Lexicon Graeco-Lat. in N. T., 205.
[115] Brief an d. Röm., 136-137.
[116] Ep. of Paul, II, 134.
[117] Two Essays, 152.
[118] Comm. on Rom., 119.

something that makes clement, or secures 'propitiation'". To believe Bushnell,[119] St. Paul, in Rom. III, 25, emphasizes the fact that the sacrifice of Christ was only propitiatory and not expiatory. His argument is: The Apostle has "propitiation through faith in his blood" and not "propitiation through his blood". Hence: "no propitiation therefore reaches the mark, that does not, on its way, reconcile, or bring into faith, the subject for whom it is made". By such an arrangement of words the Apostle takes away any possibility of the meaning of expiation; he admits, however, that the word " is commonly used by pagan writers in a way that implies expiation".

V. ΙΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ: A Means-Memorial of Expiation-Propitiation

There is finally a group of more recent commentators who hold the view that ἱλαστήριον expresses either the very general meaning of a *means of expiation or propitiation* or, if a special and definite interpretation should be offered, a *memorial or monument of expiation or propitiation.* These authors conclude that the sacrifice of Christ was the means of expiation or propitiation, or His sacrifice became as a memorial of expiation or propitiation.

1. Foremost in this class is Deissmann. In an interesting article he investigates and discusses the use and meaning of the adjective not only from a biblical point of view but also from that of later profane Greek and inscriptions. He concludes that the adjective can have a twofold signification, namely: "1) was zur Gnädigstimmung oder Versöhnung (nämlich der Gottheit oder eines Menschen) in Beziehung steht oder dient, versöhnend, propitiatorius, placatorius; 2) was zur Sühnung (nämlich der Sünde) in Beziehung steht oder dient, sühnend, expiatorius".[120] In every individual case, he says, the context is the deciding factor in determining whether the meaning is " expiatory" or "propitiatory". Coming then to the substantive in Rom. III, 25, Deissmann admits two special applications as possible: Either "Versöhnungs- oder Sühnungsopfer", or "Versöhnungs- oder Sühnungsgeschenk resp. -denkmal".[121] But does the context in Rom. III, 25 demand a special meaning? Deissmann answers emphatically in the negative and concludes: "Der Zusammenhang nötigt keineswegs zur

[119] Vicarious Sacrifice, I, 522.
[120] Op. cit., 193.
[121] Op. cit., 210.

Annahme einer Specialbedeutung oder -anwendung von ἱλαστήριον. Die Allgemeinbedeutung genügt vollständig: ein Versöhnendes oder Sühnendes, Versöhnungs- oder Sühnungsmittel".[122] Of these two special meanings he maintains as most probable: Christ must be considered "als der Sühner oder das Sühnende".[123]

Almost all more recent exegetes have adopted Deissmann's explanation. Godet[124] translates "a means of propitiation" and Lattey[125] "a means or instrument of propitiation". Parry[126] accepts "the agent of propitiation". All of them add that if the idea of sacrifice is not contained in the word itself, it follows certainly from the connection with the clause "in His blood". Schweizer,[127] Zahn,[128] Hofmann,[129] and Preuschen[130] interpret "das Sühnemittel". Stevens[131] wants it taken "in its etymological sense as a means of rendering favorable, Sühnemittel, Expiatorium". Bernard Weiss:[132] "ganz allgemein ein Mittel, wodurch die Sünde in Gottes Augen zugedeckt wird"; Beyschlag[133]: "etwas das sühnen kann, etwas Sühnkräftiges", and in Rom. III, 25, its use suggests the idea "eines Sühnmittels also, welches die Sünde vor Gott zudeckt nicht an und für sich, sondern erst durch das, was es in dem gläubigen Menschen wirkt". Usteri,[134] interpreting the term as "Sühnungsmittel", notes: "dieser Ausdruck kommt einzig und allein in dieser Stelle vor". But Lipsius insists that the word also means "Sühnmittel, nicht blos Versöhnungsmittel".[135] Both meanings, he adds, find application in Rom. III, 25, for the death of Christ was first of all "ein Opfertod an unsrer Statt" and then "sofern dieser Opfertod nöthig war um der göttlichen Gerechtigkeit willen, ein Sühnmittel".[136] To Prat[137] it signifies here "moyen d'expiation' ou 'de propitiation' ou peut-être l'un et l'autre". Sickenberger[138] also includes the twofold notion for he renders the term "ver-

[122] Op. cit., 211.
[123] Ibid.
[124] Comm. on Rom., 152.
[125] Westminster Version, III, 29.
[126] Ep. to the Rom., 66.
[127] Op. cit., 467.
[128] Brief an d. Röm., 187.
[129] Schriftbeweis, I, 226; cf. Hl. Schrift d. N. T., III, 113.
[130] Griech.-Deut. Handwörtb. z. N. T., 530.
[131] Theology of N. T., 413.
[132] Paulinische Briefe, 45; cf. Das Neue Test., 16.
[133] Neutest. Theologie, II, 147-148.
[134] Paulin. Lehrbegriff, 116.
[135] Paulin. Rechtfertigungslehre, 134.
[136] Op. cit., 144.
[137] Theologie de S. Paul, I, 288.
[138] Briefe an d. Kor. und Röm., 176.

söhnende Gabe, Sühnmittel, Sühnopfer". According to Cone[139] it means "a means of propitiation or a propitiatory sacrifice". "The sacrificial word propitiation", Beet[140] declares, "proves that the redemption is sacrificial", and hence it is better "to take the word for a means of atonement, for a propitiatory sacrifice". To Robertson[141] it signifies "propitiatory gift or means of propitiation".

2. Next in order is the interpretation which views the sacrifice of Christ as a memorial or monument of expiation or propitiation. Feine[142] translates the Pauline term "Versöhnungs- Sühnungsdenkmal". "Für diese Bedeutung spricht das Prädikat προ. Denn es deutet auf eine öffentliche Schaustellung Christi". Near to this comes Lagrange[143]: "Un monument ou plutôt un instrument de propitiation ou d'expiation"; although a person cannot be a monument, still, by the will of God "cet instrument demeure comme un monument destiné à moutrer sa justice". Holtzmann[144] has: "Sühnmal oder Sühnmittel".

Summary of Modern Exegesis

This historical survey clearly illustrates the confusion which modern exegesis has made of St. Paul's concept. With comparatively few exceptions modern authors admit that in Rom. III, 25 the term has direct reference to the sacrifice of Christ, but they widely differ as to the exact literal meaning of the word. Five interpretations lead:

1. Most commentators hold that Christ is the reality, the fulfilment, the antitype of the ἱλαστήριον in the Holy of Holies. Whether St. Paul used the word as substantive or adjective is also disputed. The majority are of opinion that he used it as a noun. Gifford[145] claims it was "constantly used in biblical Greek as a substantive in the definite concrete sense, 'place or instrument of atonement'". Olshausen,[146] Macknight,[147] and others believe St. Paul used it as an adjective and that ἐπίθεμα must be supplied.

[139] Paul, 269.
[140] Comm. on Rom., 118-119.
[141] Grammar of Greek N. T., 154.
[142] Theologie d. N. T., 309.
[143] Ep. aux Rom., 76.
[144] Lehrbuch d. neutest. Theologie, II, 111.
[145] Op. cit., 96.
[146] Op. cit., 546.
[147] Op. cit., 72.

2. A few moderns claim that ἱλαστήριον designates Christ in His sacrifice as the expiator or propitiator for sin.

3. A third group define the Pauline word as the expiatory or propitiatory sacrifice of Christ. But they disagree concerning St. Paul's use of it. Many believe he employed it as a noun, being in form the neuter of the adjective. Others, such as Luthardt,[148] Barnes,[149] Whedon,[150] George Clark,[151] Ford,[152] Fritzsche,[153] etc., assert just as firmly that the Apostle used it as an adjective and that it demands either θῦμα or ἱερεῖον as supplement.

4. A few scholars adopt the abstract meaning expiation or propitiation.

5. Later exegetes defend the meaning: Christ in His sacrifice became the means or memorial of expiation or propitiation.

Catholic theologians teach that the effects of Christ's sacrifice are redemption and justification, implying forgiveness and a complete blotting out of sin with an interior sanctification of the soul. Protestants would have it a mere external cloaking of sins which still remain; a mere imputation to the sinner of God's or Christ's justice, and they seek in Rom. III, 25 a basis for their arguments. Thus, as Briggs[154] says in reference to the sacrifice of Christ in this important verse, "the sins of his people are covered by the enduring perpetual blood of his sin-offering. Sins are 'covered once for all and forever'". Protestants also place special emphasis upon διὰ τῆς πίστεως: by the sacrifice of Christ, Divine Justice no more than opened for mankind a new way of justification leading to confidence in God's mercy, which engenders certainty of salvation. This confidence alone justifies and excludes the necessity of good works. So Bleibtreu[155] writes: "Fide! Das ist seine Voraussetzung. Non fide et operibus! Das ist seine Behauptung. Ergo sola fide! Das ist seine Schlussfolgerung. Nicht der Glaube, sondern die Alleinigkeit des Glaubens bildet den Grundgedanken in der Heilslehre des Römerbriefes".

Despite this confusion, our review of modern exegesis has furnished valuable information. It is seen how moderns choose now the element expiation, now propitiation, and sometimes both; and quite naturally the question arises whether the term does not

[148] Briefe an d. Thess., Gal., Kor., und Röm., 339.
[149] Notes on Rom., 98.
[150] Comm. on N. T., III, 316.
[151] Rom. and Cor., 58.
[152] Comm. on Rom., 95.
[153] Pauli ad Rom. Ep., I, 193.
[154] Op. cit., 148.
[155] Op. cit., 550.

contain more than one element. Again it has been noticed that not a few scholars referred to the primary, literal meaning of ἱλαστήριον as a place of expiation or propitiation; this raises a second question: Is this the original meaning, or is ἱλαστήριον a general term for a means of expiation or propitiation?

Our attention was also drawn to the several sources whence modern commentators derive their meaning. Many go to the O. T. only; others base their arguments on profane Greek literature; still others have recourse to the writings of the patristic age. Wherefore it becomes necessary to take up all these sources separately and, by a careful and complete study of each, to find a solution for this all important word.

It is an incontestable fact, recognized more every day by modern scholars, that the patristic age is the important period for the solution of scriptural difficulties. Hence the necessity of consulting the writings of these eminent expounders of Christian doctrine in the present discussion. These writers will undoubtedly throw much light on the exegetical history of Rom. III, 25, since they give us the earliest explanation. We, therefore, submit the works of both the Greek and Latin Fathers to thorough examination in order to ascertain their views on a word which has proved such a baffling problem to modern exegetes.

2. IN THE GREEK FATHERS

Here already it must be stated that the interpretation of ἱλαστήριον in Greek patristic literature constitutes a remarkably uniform contrast to modern exegesis. Modern commentators, with exceptions of course, start out with the supposition that the term is best explained through the context in which it is found, instead of first seeking the correct meaning of the word and then testing whether this meaning is in conformity with the context. The Fathers, on the contrary, first establish the source and then interpret Rom. III, 25 accordingly. They seek the origin of the word in the O. T. and their fundamental idea is that the O. T. use of ἱλαστήριον describes it as a place where God was present to distribute His mercy. Christ is the real fulfilment of His type in the Holy of Holies. In other words, the essential signification for the Greek Fathers is locality. To grasp the importance of this fact and to let their exegesis of Rom. III, 25 appear in its proper light, it will be useful to give a few general illustrations of the trend of thought among Greek patristic writers.

Athanasius, arguing against the Arians, constructs the following dilemma. When the Israelites were commanded to go up to Jerusalem to adore in the temple, where the ark was and above it the *ἱλαστήριον—ἔνθα ἡ κιβωτὸς καὶ ὑπεράνω ταύτης . . . τὸ ἱλαστήριον*, was their act of adoration worthy of praise or blame? If the latter, why were those punished who neglected this duty? And if their conduct was praiseworthy, as the Arians admit it was, why do they refuse to adore the Lord in His flesh as existing in a temple—*τὸν Κύριον ἐν σαρκί, ὡς ἐν ναῷ ὄντα, προσκυνεῖν*, since the type ceased with the coming of the reality—*ἐκθούσης δὲ τῆς ἀληθείας, πέπαυται λοιπὸν ὁ τύπος?*[156] The contrast is significant. The *ἱλαστήριον*, guarded by the cherubim, designated the special locality in the temple of the O. T. where the Israelites were commanded to adore. This type was supplanted by Christ the reality. His flesh was the temple containing the N. T. *ἱλαστήριον*, the real place of adoration.

Cyril of Alexandria, expounding Jn. vii, 14, gives more interesting information. He begins by stating that God dwells everywhere. "We believe, however, that He more emphatically dwells in holy places and very reasonably may we infer that the divine nature is revealed to us in places especially sacred—*τῇ θείᾳ φύσει ἀκουστὸν ἡμῖν ἐν ἱεροῖς μάλιστα τόποις ἔσεσθαι*". Immediately he adds: "But *what* was described to the Jews in type and figure, *that* Christ now changes into reality—*ὅπερ δὲ πάλιν ἐν τύπῳ καὶ σκιᾷ τοῖς ἀνωτέρω κατεγράφετο, τοῦτο νῦν εἰς ἀλήθειαν μετασκευάζει Χριστός*". He then explains: God ordered Moses to place the propitiatory over the ark and there He would instruct and speak to him. The propitiatory was, then, the peculiarly sacred spot where the divine manifestation resided. Therefore, he continues, when St. John records Christ's going up into the temple to teach the people, he means to say that Christ *as God* went up into the hallowed place consecrated to God—*ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς τε καὶ ἀνακειμένοις τῷ Θεῷ τόποις παρελθὼν ὡς Θεός.*[157] His presence as God was not perceived by the Jews just as the presence of God over the propitiatory was imperceptible. With us the type has become realized—*ὁ δὲ τοῦ πράγματος τύπος ἀληθὴς ἐφ' ἡμῶν*, because Christ Himself as *ἱλαστήριον* is now the particular spot sanctifying the temple just as the O. T. *ἱλαστήριον* was the one that sanctified the temple. And Christ, although dwelling among the Jews in His flesh, now speaks to

[156] MPG, 26, 1080-1081, Ep. ad Adelphium.
[157] MPG, 73, 653.

them as once God did from the propitiatory—*ὥσπερ οὖν ἐκ τοῦ ἱλαστηρίου πάλαι ὁ Θεός.*[158] According to this explanation the O. T. *ἱλαστήριον* was the particular place where God manifested Himself and communicated His orders to Moses. Christ now, being the antitype, is the real place where God manifests Himself to men and communicates with them.

NILUS, in *Peristeria* IV, where we find a short treatise on prayer, writes that any place is suitable for prayer, for it is not so much the place as the sentiments of the one praying that make the prayer. It was of no benefit, he says, for the Jews to approach even to the most impenetrable part of the temple and there, devoutly surrounding the propitiatory—*περιπτυσσόμενοι σπουδαίως τὸ ἱλαστήριον*—to pray, because God would not hear their prayers since their hands were full of blood (Is. I, 15).[159] Nilus evidently refers to the *ἱλαστήριον* in the Holy of Holies as the place *κατ' ἐξοχήν* where the Jews might expect to be heard.

In *Quaest. in Levit.*, THEODORET of Cyrus quotes Lev. XVI, 2 as evidence that God manifested His own peculiar presence in the propitiatory—*ἐν τῷ ἱλαστηρίῳ τὴν οἰκείαν ἐπιφάνειαν ὁ Δεσπότης ἐποιεῖτο Θεός.*[160] Commenting on Ps. CXXXI, 8 he informs us that through the propitiatory the High Priest obtained knowledge of the divine presence—*δι' ἐκείνου [ἱλαστηρίου] δὲ τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ μηνύματά τινα τῆς θείας ἐπιφανείας ἐγίνετο.*[161] Quoting from Is. LXVI, 1, he adds that God does not dwell in temples made by hands but that heaven is His throne and the earth His footstool. "What is this house which you will build to me? and what is this place of my rest?"[162]

These few examples show that, in the mind of the Greek Fathers, the O. T. *ἱλαστήριον* was the place of adoration, prayer, and divine manifestation. As we shall see they base their interpretation of *ἱλαστήριον* in Rom. III, 25 upon this use of the term in the O. T. and for them the word was self explanatory.

The most detailed exposition of Rom. III, 25 is given by ORIGEN in his commentary on the epistle to the Romans, of which we have only the Latin recension by Rufinus.

Origen's first step is to find the source, and he believes St. Paul adopted the word from the O. T. This is evident from the following: "Et videtur propitiatorium hoc, de quo scriptum est in Exodo, ad nullum nisi ad Salvatorem Dominum retulisse cum

[158] Op. cit., 656.
[159] MPG, 79, 829.
[160] MPG, 80, 328.
[161] MPG, 80, 1905.
[162] Op. cit., 1908.

dicit, quia hunc posuit 'Deus propitiatorium per fidem'".[163] In his commentary on St. John's gospel Origen speaks of Christ as our advocate, ἱλασμός, and τὸ ἱλαστήριον. As proof for the first two appellations he cites I Jn. II, 1-2, and for the third, Rom. III, 25. To the latter quotation he adds the remark that the golden propitiatory in the Holy of Holies was a shadow of the Pauline ἱλαστήριον—οὗ ἱλαστηρίου εἰς τὰ ἐσώτατα καὶ Ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων σκιά τις ἐτύγχανε τὸ χρυσοῦν ἱλαστήριον.[164]

Having now established the foundation for the Pauline term he proceeds to determine more precisely its full meaning. Since the Apostle writes that Christ was proposed as ἱλαστήριον through faith in His blood, it is necessary to investigate "quae sit propitiatio quae per sanguinem fiat", so that we can understand "quomodo etiam per sanguinem Jesu propitiatio facta sit". Origen returns to the sacrificial ritual of the Mosaic law and proves from Ps. CIX, 4 and Hebr. v that in the N. T. Christ Himself is the priest who offers the sacrifice; and from Jn. I, 29 that He is also the Lamb that is slain. Hence he calls Christ "propitiatorium, et pontificem, et hostiam quae offertur pro populo". As victim Christ effected expiation "profusione sanguinis sui" and this effect consisted "in eo quod dat remissionem praecedentium delictorum".[165] Acccording to these quotations Christ by His sacrifice made expiation and procured propitiation.

That the notion of sacrifice flows into the elements of expiation and propitiation, appears distinctly from Origen's homily 24 *In Numeros*. As long as sin existed it required victims for sin, and the sacrifice thereof was intended "ad reconciliandum hominibus Deum". If sin had not entered the world Christ would not necessarily have had to become man and the Lamb of God. "Peccati autem necessitas propitiationem requirit"; but "propitiatio non fit nisi per hostiam" and therefore "necessarium fuit provideri hostiam pro peccato". Christ was this one victim and such was the cleansing power of His sacrifice "ut una sola sufficeret pro totius mundi salute".[166] Thus we learn that "propitiatio" involves sacrifice, "hostia" points out the expiatory element, while "reconciliatio" and "salus" describe the propitiatory element.

To prevent anyone thinking that this doctrine is a fond invention of St. Paul's, Origen refers also to I Jn. II, 1-2. To him St.

[163] MPG, 14, 947.
[164] MPG, 14, 89.
[165] MPG, 14, 950.
[166] MPG, 12, 757-758. Cf. 12, 454 and 754.

John seems to enhance the atonement mystery by declaring that Christ is advocate and ἱλασμός not only for the sins of the faithful but also for those of the whole world. Both apostles speak of Christ in one and the same sense. Therefore, he concludes, it matters little which way ἱλαστήριον is taken, "sive 'propitiator', sive 'propitiatorium', sive 'propitiatio', sive etiam 'exoratio' . . . , cum apud Graecos uno semper eodemque sermone proferatur". He adds a curious remark: "Nisi forte videatur quibusdam 'propitiatio' ipsa ejus divina substantia; 'propitiator' vero, cum dispensationes in hominibus explet, intelligi".[167] Which would mean that "propitiatio" refers to the divine nature in Christ and "propiator" to His human nature.

Our conclusion from Origen must be this. The Pauline term expresses the reality of what the symbol in the Holy of Holies typified. The notion of sacrifice enters intimately into Origen's exegesis. His remark that the word was employed by the Greeks with various meanings is an indication that Origen was quite familiar with a situation which is a difficult problem to us.

From his exposition of Ps. LXXIX, 3-4 wherein Rom. III, 25 is quoted, it is evident that, to EUSEBIUS of Caesarea also, ἱλαστήριον represented the reality of what was prefigured by the O. T. symbol. He explains the propitiatory in the Holy of Holies as an image and exemplar—εἰκόνα καὶ τύπον—of Him whom Ezechiel saw in a vision (Ez. I), namely, the Verbum Dei and adds as evidence the Pauline quotation of Rom. III, 25.[168]

In book VIII of the *Demonstratio Evangelica,* Eusebius shows how the prophecy given to Daniel (IX, 27) was fulfiled with the advent of Christ. The world stood in need of a living and a real ἱλασμός — δεῖσθαι δὲ πᾶν τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος ἱλασμοῦ ζῶντος καὶ ἀληθινοῦ. The sacrifices of the O. T. were ineffective because they could not completely remove sin. However they served as types of what was to come. "Especially was the Mosaic ἱλαστήριον a type—τύπον ἔφερε τὸ παρὰ Μωσεῖ κατασκευασθὲν ἱλαστήριον, and its antitype was no other than our Saviour and Lord—οὗτος δὲ ἦν ὁ Σωτὴρ καὶ Κύριος ἡμῶν, who, in the words of St. John (I, 29), is the Lamb that takes away the sins of the world".[169]

Again the O. T. type offers the foundation for Eusebius's interpretation. Christ is its antitype, i. e., the place where, by His

[167] MPG, 14, 951.
[168] MPG, 23, 956.
[169] MPG, 22, 601.

sacrifice as Lamb, He expiates all sins and propitiates God. Just as clear is the distinction between ἱλασμός and ἱλαστήριον. As ἱλαστήριον Christ is the true place; as ἱλασμός His sacrifice is the means of procuring a real and living expiation and propitiation for the world.

Basil, the Great, expounding Ps. xlviii, 8, warns against seeking a brother as redeemer, or any mere man instead of some one who surpasses our nature; the reason being precisely because all men are sinners. That *someone* is none other than "the God-man Jesus Christ who needs no ἐξίλασμα, nor is His soul to be redeemed". Basil next describes how Christ wrought our redemption: not by ransom—μετὰ λύτρων, neither by gifts—μετὰ δώρων, but by His own blood—ἐν τῷ ἑαυτοῦ αἵματι. As evidence for his statements Basil quotes Rom. iii, 25, and concludes by saying that Christ could redeem us since he needs no ἱλασμός but is Himself ἱλαστήριον—οὐ γὰρ ἱλασμοῦ δεῖται ἀλλ' αὐτός εστιν ἱλαστήριον.[170]

According to Basil Christ as God-man could expiate the sins of all men and redeem them. It clearly appears from the quotations that Basil distinguishes between ἐξίλασμα, ἱλασμός, and ἱλαστήριον; the former two pointing to the means employed, i. e., the sacrifice of Christ, while the latter points directly to Him. The contrast of ἱλασμός to ἱλαστήριον, together with the local meaning of ἱλαστήριον, demands the contextual sense that Christ by means of His sacrifice became the place of expiation and propitiation.

Gregory of Nyssa in a very expressive application avers that "by considering Christ as ἱλαστήριον in His blood—ἱλαστήριον ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ αἵματι ὁ Χριστὸς νοούμενος, we are taught that each and every one becomes a ἱλαστήριον himself — αὐτὸν ἕκαστον γενέσθαι ἑαυτῷ ἱλαστήριον — through cleansing the soul by death-like mortification".[171] Previously he enumerates more than 25 titles indicating the office, power, and qualities of Christ. Among them we find: Christ The Redemption, High Priest, Paschal Lamb, and ἱλαστήριον ψυχῶν.[172] Again, in *De Vita Moysis,* when dealing with the signification of the propitiatory in the Holy of Holies, Gregory says oddly enough that "its meaning needs no explanation since St. Paul clearly defined it when he wrote: Whom God hath proposed as ἱλαστήριον of our souls—ὃν προέθετο ὁ Θεὸς ἱλαστήριον τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν".[173]

[170] MPG, 29, 440-441.
[171] MPG, 46, 264, De Perfecta Christ. Forma.
[172] MPG, 46, 253.
[173] MPG, 46, 384.

The meaning, then, of ἱλαστήριον must have been perefctly clear to Gregory and his readers. In the first quotation it is interesting to observe that we can become a ἱλαστήριον by acts of penance and mortification. These acts are the means, and the only possible idea expressed by ἱλαστήριον is that of locality; namely, we are the place where, by means of penance and mortification, expiation and propitiation are offered. Then Christ as ἱλαστήριον of souls means that He is the sanctuary, the realization of the O. T. type, where souls find expiation and propitiation. While the type was sprinkled with blood in order to procure expiation and propitiation, Christ effected the same for us by His own blood. Gregory's curious remark concerning the self-evident meaning of the O. T. ἱλαστήριον, gives the important and direct information that St. Paul applied the term to Christ with that same fundamental meaning which it has in O. T. usage.

What is doubtless a copy of Basil's interpretation of the Pauline word as found in his commentary on Ps. XLVIII, 8, is given by DIDYMUS the Blind in his exposition of the same psalm.[174] But Didymus also presents us with his own exegesis in his commentary on Ps. CXXIX, 4. "Christ the Saviour, expiating and dissolving sins — ὁ ἱλασκόμενος καὶ ἀφεὶς τὰς ἁμαρτίας Σωτήρ, is our ἱλασμός. Since all men have sinned, all also need the ἱλασμός of Christ by which salvation is obtained—χρεία τοῦ παρὰ σοῦ ἱλασμοῦ ἱλασκομένου τῆς πάντων ἕνεκα σωτηρίας". To prove that Christ expiated the sins of all and redeemed all, thus effecting propitiation, Didymus quotes I Jn. II, 1-2 and Rom. III, 23-25.[175]

As employed by EPIPHANIUS, ἱλαστήριον retains its fundamental meaning of locality as well as the double idea of expiation and propitiation. In *Ancoratus* LXV he discusses the advent of the Saviour into the world. Citing the words of St. Paul (Rom. VIII, 3 and I Cor. I, 30) he portrays the coming of Christ in the likeness of sinful flesh in order to redeem us from servitude, corruption, and death; Christ has become justice, sanctification, and redemption. The last three words Epiphanius refers to the blotting out of sin, to our justification and our deliverance by the blood of Christ, and then he adds: ἱλαστήριον καθάρσεως κόσμου, καταλλαγῆς ἁπάντων ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ [ἐπὶ] γῆς.[176] Again we see the antithesis to the O. T. ἱλαστήριον. The latter served as the special

[174] MPG, 39, 1384-1385.
[175] MPG, 39, 1585-1588.
[176] MPG, 43, 133. Cf. 42, 477, Adv. Haer., III, 1.

place of expiation and propitiation for the Israelites only; Christ, the reality, is in His sacrifice the place of expiation for the world (*καθάρσεως κόσμου*) and the place of propitiation for all peoples (*καταλλαγῆς ἁπάντων*). The element of sacrifice is essentially contained in this notion, because it is only through the shedding of His blood that Christ became the N. T. *ἱλαστήριον*.

The exegesis of Rom. III, 25 by JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, the greatest commentator of St. Paul, is brief but pointed. He calls attention to this that the Apostle has *ἱλαστήριον ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι*, thus recalling to mind the O. T. sheep and oxen offered in sacrifice for sin. If their blood-shedding served in a manner to free from sin, he writes, how much more valuable must be the blood of Christ. He then points out the use of *ἀπολύτρωσις* by St. Paul in preference to *λύτρωσις*, which shows that "our redemption was not merely a delivery from sin but a real buying back, the ransom being the sacrificial death of Christ". For this reason, he adds, the Apostle calls Christ *ἱλαστήριον*, arguing that "if the type (*τύπος*) had such expiatory and propitiatory power, the reality (*ἀλήθεια*) must have by far greater".[177] By the term *τύπος* Chrysostom most probably aims at the O. T. *ἱλαστήριον* as the foundation of the Pauline word. Christ in His own blood is the reality of this type and the fulfilment of the symbolic animal sacrifices of the O. T.[178]

HESYCHIUS, priest and monk of Jerusalem, quotes Rom. III, 25 in his exposition of Lev. XVI, 2. He finds a figure of Christ in all that concerns the O. T. propitiatory. Christ is the "verum et intelligibile propitiatorium, utpote qui ipse nobis peccatorum propitiationem praestat". His flesh served as the veil of His divinity just as the Holy of Holies was shielded by a veil—velamen enim Christus habet carnem, tegumentum divinitatis suae, quemadmodum et hoc quod erat sensibile velamen tegumentum Sanctis sanctorum fuit.[179] Expounding v. 14 he writes that Christ offered His sacrifice for the remission of sins. Christ suffered for our propitiation and enlightenment and therefore the very passion

[177] MPG, 60, 444.

[178] Chrysostom offers a striking parallel in homily 2, Sermo de Cruce et Latrone (MPG, 49, 408). He states that the cross was an altar (*θυσιαστήριον ἦν ὁ σταυρός*). If the cross was an altar, i. e., the place of offering Christ's sacrifice, then the Pauline *ἱλαστήριον*, being so inseparably connected with the sacrifice of Christ, would seem to find its best interpretation as a place of expiation and propitiation.

[179] MPG, 93, 983-984.

is called propitiatorium — ad propitiationem enim nostram, simulque illuminationem, passio salutaris peracta est: unde ipsa passio dicitur propitiatorium.[180] Hesychius sees in the Pauline term an expression of reality in contrast to the O. T. symbol. This reality is Christ, who is both God and man, by whose sacrifice expiation and propitiation were wrought. "Propitiatio" is to Hesychius the expiatory and propitiatory sacrifice of Christ as means of redemption; "propitiatorium" is Christ Himself, as place through which "propitiatio" proceeds. In calling the passion "propitiatorium" Hesychius would seem to understand this figuratively since, if taken out of its context, the more natural sense would behold in the passion the means of expiation and propitiation.

Cyril of Alexandria quotes and explains the Pauline term a number of times. In the exposition of the epistle to the Romans he thus comments on v. 25: "Christ, by offering His own blood as ransom for the life of all—*τῆς ἁπάντων ζωῆς ἀντάλλαγμα τὸ ἴδιον αἷμα*, saved all for heaven—*σέσωκε τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανόν*, and rendered His Father propitious and merciful".[181] The objects of *ἱλαστήριον* are here the sacrificial expiation of sin by the blood of Christ and the reconciliation of mankind with God.

Deeper knowledge of Cyril's exegesis is gleaned from the IX book, *De Adoratione in Spiritu et Veritate*. In a dialogue with Palladius, Cyril explains the symbolism of the ark and the propitiatory; both are types of Christ. Taken literally the latter was a golden plate placed over the ark of the covenant. Regarded figuratively it represents Him who became man for us; as evidence Cyril quotes I Jn. II, 1-2 and Rom. III, 25. He continues: "For through Christ we obtain *ἱλασμός* — *δι' αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἱλασμός*, and so Christ *Αὐτὸς οὖν ἄρα τὸ ἱλαστήριον*".[182] The distinction drawn between *ἱλασμός* and *ἱλαστήριον*, together with the reference to the O. T. suggests that Christ as *ἱλαστήριον* is the place where *ἱλασμός* is given.

Palladius, however, craves more information and Cyril again affirms that ark and propitiatory were types of Christ, quoting once more I Jn. II, 1-2 and stating that in Rom. III, 25 St. Paul refers to Christ as *ἱλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως*. Cyril bases his explanation on the statement in Ex. XXV, 22 that God would speak to Moses from over the propitiatory from the midst of the two cherubim. "Christ is *τὸ ἱλαστήριον* placed on high—*τὸ ἱλαστήριον*,

[180] MPG, 93, 995. [181] MPG, 74, 780. [182] MPG, 68, 600.

τὸ ὑψοῦ κείμενον, and is guarded by the heavenly powers, signifying that the Son is known to us not only as man but also as God and the Lord of all—*οὐ γὰρ ἐκ μόνων ἡμῖν τῶν τῆς κενώσεως τρόπων γνώριμος ὁ Υἱός, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ ὧν ἐστι Θεὸς καὶ τῶν ὅλων Κύριος*". "At the *ἱλαστήριον* the adoration proper to God alone was offered; therefore the place above the cherubim makes manifest to us pre-eminently the divine nature—*ὁ ὑπεράνω τῶν Χερουβὶμ τόπος, καὶ αἰσθητῶς . . . μονονουχὶ τὴν θείαν ἡμῖν καταδηλοῖ φύσιν*".[183]

In book x Cyril compares Christ to the he-goat sacrificed on the Atonement day. This entire ceremony, he says, found its fulfilment in Christ who was without sin, bore our sins, and died for us on the cross. "Christ was made for us not only *ἱλασμός* but also *ἱλαστήριον*—*γέγονε γὰρ ἡμῖν ἱλασμός τε καὶ ἱλαστήριον, ὁ Χριστός*. In His blood there is granted salvation and life to the world—*τὴν τοῦ κόσμου σωτηρίαν καὶ ζωήν*, and a most perfect cleansing—*τελεωτάτην . . . τὴν ἀποκάθαρσιν*—to all, Jews as well as Gentiles".[184]

In the same book Cyril explains to Palladius the symbolism of the voice that spoke to Moses from over the propitiatory. This also is applicable to Christ, "*τὸ ἀληθὲς ἱλαστήριον*, who said that the words which He spoke were not His but those of His Father who sent Him (Jn. vi, 64). And, as the Scriptures testify, He is also *ἱλαστήριον . . . ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτίων ἡμῶν*".[185] Here again we notice that Cyril also identifies Christ as *ἱλαστήριον* with His Father. Just as the Father manifested Himself to Moses and spoke to him from over the propitiatory so now in Christ as *ἱλαστήριον* is the divinity manifested.

In Cyril's comment on Hab. iii, 2 we are told that, according to St. Paul, Christ is *ἱλαστήριον διὰ τῆς πίστεως* and, as such "He freed us from every charge, rendered His Father propitious and easy of access". With the advent of Christ, Cyril proceeds, the obscure types and figures of the O. T. became realized. Thus the typical propitiatory had its reality in Christ.[186] Then follows the emphatic remark that "although Christ was made flesh and set forth by the Father as *ἱλαστήριον*, yet He ceased not to be what He was, namely, God—*ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ γέγονε σάρξ, καὶ τέθειται παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἱλαστήριον, οὐκ ἀποβέβληκεν ὅπερ ἦν, τουτέστι, τὸ εἶναι Θεός*". "The cherubim still surround *τὸ ἱλαστήριον* and contemplate it unceasingly". After these preliminaries Cyril explains the words of the prophet thus: "Thou wilt be known, O Lord, from the

[183] MPG, 68, 620.
[184] MPG, 68, 688.
[185] MPG, 68, 717.
[186] MPG, 71, 897.

type and figure in the Holy of Holies. When made similar to us in the flesh Thou hast become the ἱλαστήριον. Thou wilt stand in the midst of the two animals, i. e., the two cherubim guarding the propitiatory and Thy name will be τὸ Ἱλαστήριον".[187]

To summarize Cyril's exegesis: God, sin and man are always the objects of ἱλαστήριον. The notion of sacrifice enters intimately into the word and Cyril clearly distinguishes ἱλασμός from ἱλαστήριον. In Christ as ἱλαστήριον the divine presence is manifested just as it was made manifest above the O. T. symbolic place. Christ's piacular sacrifice was the ἱλασμός, the means of redemption for all people. Several times Cyril calls Christ ἱλαστήριον διὰ (τῆς) πίστεως and quotes no more of Rom. III, 25.[188] This certainly must have been done intentionally by him with a definite end in view. Mathis[189] has conclusively proven that the general function of πίστις in the Pauline epistles is that of *reality* in contrast to *mere appearance*. This conclusion may well be applied to Cyril's quotations. By continually appending διὰ τῆς πίστεως to ἱλαστήριον Cyril would prove that the Pauline use of the word expresses the *reality* as against the O. T. *mere appearance*.

Theodoret of Cyrus offers the interpretation with which we are already familiar. In Rom. III, 25 St. Paul teaches that Christ the Lord is the real ἱλαστήριον—τὸ ἀληθινὸν ἱλαστήριον ὁ Δεσπότης ἐστὶ Χριστός; of this the O. T. ἱλαστήριον bore the type—τὸ παλαιὸν τούτου τὸν τύπον ἐπλήρου.[190] Again, Rom. III, 25 occurs in Theodoret's commentary on Ez. XLIII, 10-15. The two ἱλαστήρια which the prophet saw in his vision of the new temple, the one being larger than the other, refer to the ἱλαστήριον of the O. and N. T. Hence, since the O. T. was a type of the New, the ἱλαστήριον of the former was also a type of the latter—τύπος γὰρ . . . τὸ ἱλαστήριον ἐκεῖνο τοῦ ἡμετέρου ἱλαστηρίου, and this is Christ—Χριστὸς δέ ἐστι τὸ ἡμέτερον ἱλαστήριον.[191]

The conclusion is obvious. Christ is the reality of what was symbolized by the O. T. place where expiation and propitiation were procured by sacrifice.

Cosmas Indicopleustas, in *Topographia* V, uses the Pauline word in support of his argument that Christ in His incarnation became the N. T. reality in contrast to the type in the Holy of Holies—

[187] Op. cit., 900.
[188] See also 71, 905 and 908
[189] The Pauline ΠΙΣΤΙΣ–ΥΠΟΣΤΑΣΙΣ, Washington, 1920.
[190] MPG, 82, 84. [191] MPG, 81, 1232.

τύπος δὲ ἦν τὸ ἱλαστήριον τοῦ Δεσπότου Χριστοῦ κατὰ σάρκα.[192] Elsewhere Cosmas states that the O. T. symbol foreshadowed the office of the Lord Christ—τάξιν ἐπέχον τοῦ Δεσπότου Χριστοῦ.[193] Again we see that Christ the reality replaced the O. T. type. As God was present and made Himself manifest in the type, so is He also present and becomes manifest in the incarnation of Christ, who is the real place of expiation and propitiation.

In the exposition of Rom. III, 25 JOHN of Damascus, the last Greek writer whom we shall quote, proclaims the O. T. ἱλαστήριον the type—ὁ τύπος ἦν, ἐκεῖνο τὸ ἱλαστήριον; and the blood by which the people were sanctified a symbol of Christ's blood—τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ σύμβουλον ἐκεῖνο τὸ αἷμα τὸ ἁγιάζον τὸν λαόν.[194] The passage explains itself. Christ is the reality in contrast to the O. T. type. His blood made expiation for us and sanctified us.

Summary of the Greek Patristic Literature

The results of our inquiry among the Greek Fathers are briefly these:

1) Their exegesis for the Pauline term has its roots in the O. T.
   a) Jesus Christ as ἱλαστήριον is the reality of the type in the Holy of Holies.
   b) Jesus Christ is the fulfilment of the typical sacrifices of the O. T.

2) The sacrifice of Christ is treated by the Fathers quite generally as wholly inseparable from the term ἱλαστήριον. Both are intimately related.

3) The fundamental content of the term is locality, i. e., the special place within the Holy of Holies, and of this Christ is the reality. Moreover it contains essentially the ideas of
   a) expiation, with the removal of sin for its object;
   b) propitiation, including as terminus ad quem man who was redeemed, as terminus a quo God who was reconciled;
   c) manifestation of divinity.

4) The more precise meaning, then, is this:
   a) as the O. T. ἱλαστήριον was the particular place where expiation and propitiation were obtained for the Israelites by the sprinkling of blood upon the propitiatory, so Christ by His self-sacrifice and in His own blood became localized expiation and propitiation for all men;

[192] MPG, 88, 209; cf. 208. [193] MPG, 88, 245. [194] MPG, 95, 465.

b) as the O. T. ἱλαστήριον was the centre where the divine presence manifested itself, so Christ is the place where in His divine person the presence of the Godhead is manifested.

5) Ἱλαστήριον is quite distinct from ἱλασμός. While the latter indicates the means of expiation and propitiation, the former has reference to locality. In the sanctuary of Christ's own person as ἱλαστήριον, ἱλασμός was achieved through the sacrifice in His own blood. Thus all the O. T. elements combined find their fulfilment in Christ the reality.

In view of the confusion in modern exegesis of Rom. III, 25, the unanimous consistency of Greek patristic interpretation is indeed remarkable. And, in determining the source and definite signification of the Pauline term, such uniformity is a weighty argument which may not be ignored.

3. IN THE LATIN FATHERS

In Latin patristic literature Rom. III, 25 occurs but rarely, nor do the Fathers who cite the verse furnish us with such exhaustive and complete material as is the case with the Greeks.

Hilary of Poitiers adverts to the Pauline term in his commentary on Ps. LXIV, 4-5. The human race, under the yoke of philosophical errors, cried to God for enlightenment, knowing that God must be placated for past sins and crimes of impiety through Christ—"scientes tandem vetera delicta sua et antiquae impietatis crimina Deo propitianda esse per Christum". This light they obtained through St. Paul and St. John. From the former, when he says: "Quem proposuit Deus placationem per fidem in suo sanguine"; from the latter, when he writes of Christ: "Ipse est placatio pro peccatis nostris". Then Hilary puts the question: "Qui tandem propitiationis effectus est"? He answers by quoting v. 5: Beatus quem elegisti et assumpsisti, ut inhabitet in tabernaculis tuis.[195] Thus the effect is shown to consist in the peace and bliss of heaven.

Elsewhere[196] Hilary speaks of Christ's sacrifice which reconciled us to God, redeemed us, and took away our sins—"est enim Unigenitus Dei filius Deus Verbum redemptio nostra, pax nostra in cujus sanguine reconciliati Deo sumus. . . Filius ipse pro peccatis nostris et propitiatio et redemptio et deprecatio est". Hilary

[195] MPL, 9, 415.

[196] MPL, 9, 723, Ps. CXXIX, 9.

therefore found in "placatio" and "propitiatio" the elements of expiation by which sin was removed, and propitiation by which God was reconciled. Sin, God, and man are then the components of the two terms.

Who is He, AMBROSE asks, of whom it is written: "Ecce Agnus Dei, ecce qui tollit peccatum mundi. . . Quem proposuit Deus propitiatorem per fidem in sanguine ipsius"? No other than the Verbum Dei, the same who tells Moses: "Impones propitiatorium super arcam desuper . . . et innotescam tibi inde, et loquar tibi desuper".[197] It is noteworthy that Ambrose translates "propitiatorem"; yet he identifies Christ as propitiator with the O. T. "propitiatorium". The reference to the O. T. type hinges on its special quality as the place where God made Himself known and manifested His presence. Again, Ambrose explains that Christ needed not propitiation, but is Himself "propitiatio omnium . . , et ipse est universorum redemptio". His redeeming blood had this effect: "non quaeritur ergo propitiatio, aut redemptio singulorum; quia omnium pretium sanguis est Christi, quo nos redemit Dominus Jesus, qui solus Patrem reconciliavit".[198] Mention must be made that the distinction between *ἱλαστήριον* and *ἱλασμός* in the Greek Fathers is not identical with "propitiator" and "propiatio" of Ambrose.

According to JEROME Christ is the real and true "propitiatorium". Commenting on the two "propitiatoria" seen by the prophet Ezechiel Jerome applies both to Christ: "Propitiatorium minus est, quando exinanivit se formam servi accipiens, et propitiatorium majus, quando recepit gloriam, quam habuit apud Patrem antequam mundus fieret".[199] This allegory implies 1) that Christ is the N. T. propitiatory in His humanity as well as in His divinity, 2) equality with the Father.

With AUGUSTINE propitiation can be effected only through sacrifice. "Quid est, fieri Deum impietati propitium? id est ignoscentem et veniam dantem. Sed ut Dei venia impetretur, propitiatio fit per aliquod sacrificium". Such is the propitiation wrought by Christ in His incarnation—"hoc holocaustum obtulit Deo . . . et impietates nostrae propitiatae sunt".[200] Making use of similar terms Augustine teaches that Christ's blood expiated for all sins and redeemed mankind, and here he says emphatically:

[197] MPL, 14, 577-578, De Fuga Saec., III, 16.
[198] MPL., 14, 1161, Ps. XLVIII, 10.
[199] MPL, 25, 422, In Ez. XLIII. [200] MPL, 36, 777, Ps. LXIV, 4.

"Quae est ista propitiatio, nisi sacrificium? Et quod est sacrificium, nisi quod pro nobis oblatum est? Sanguis innocens fusus delevit omnia peccata nocentium; pretium tantum datum redemit omnes captivos de manu captivantis inimici".[201] In another passage[202] Augustine explains propitiation as "placationem qua flectat Deum pro peccatis". Thus God, man, and sin are included as objects of "propitiatio". Twice[203] Augustine renders the Pauline word by "propitiatorium" without, however, offering any explanation. This would suggest that he saw in St. Paul's use of the term an obvious reference to the O. T. propitiatory as a type of Christ.

Gregory the Great refers Rom. III, 25 to the propitiatory in the Holy of Holies: "Quid est quod in tabernaculo propitiatorium fieri jubetur, . . . nisi quod utraque Testamenta ita sibi in Mediatore Dei et hominum congruunt? Quid enim per propitiatorium nisi ipse Redemptor humani generis designatur"?[204] This same comparison is found in another passage, but here he quotes I Jn. II, 2 and says: "Quid vero per propitiatorium nisi incarnatus Dominus figuratur"?[205] With the Greek Fathers, Gregory considers Christ as the real place of expiation and propitiation. The quotation of the Johannine use of the abstract noun would seem to indicate that Gregory did not distinguish between ἱλαστήριον and ἱλασμός.

Summary of the Latin Patristic Literature

To recapitulate: The Latin Fathers, while not expressing themselves with such clearness as the Greeks concerning the double element, nevertheless interpret the terms "propitiatio", "placatio", and "deprecatio" as Christ's sacrifice effecting expiation of sin, propitiation of God, and reconciliation between God and man; "propitiatorium" as Christ Himself, the antitype of the "propitiatorium" in the Holy of Holies. Of special importance are the words of Augustine that "propitiatio" is effected "per sacrificium". Meager as it is, the Latin patristic exegesis of St. Paul's term shows acquaintance with and runs parallel to that of the Greek Fathers.

[201] MPL, 37, 1697, Ps. CXXIX, 4.
[202] MPL, 36, 549, Ps. XLVIII, 9.
[203] MPL, 44, 133, De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione, I, 27; 213, De Spir. et Lit. XIII.
[204] MPL. 76, 835, Hom. in Ez. I, 6.
[205] MPL, 76, 1191, Hom. in Evang. II, 25.

4. IN THE EXEGESIS OF THE MIDDLE AGES DOWN TO MODERN TIMES

The exegesis of St. Paul's concept in this period follows in the main that of the patristic writers. We deem it best to arrange the authors in groups according to the various interpretations; these fall into four divisions. *Ἱλαστήριον* in Rom. III, 25 designates 1) Christ as the N. T. reality against the type in the Holy of Holies; 2) Christ as expiator or propitiator; 3) the expiatory or propitiatory sacrifice of Christ; 4) the sacrifice of Christ as a means of expiation or propitiation.

1. For the first view might be quoted more than 50 authors, all of whom explicitly state that Christ is the reality in contrast to the O. T. mere appearance. This interpretation was quite prevalent during the middle ages among Greek as well as Latin writers. It will do to mention Isidore of Seville (636),[206] Venerable Bede (735),[207] Rabanus Maurus (856),[208] Atto Vercellensis (960),[209] Oecumenius (X cent.),[210] Theophylact (ca. 1100),[211] Rupert Tuitiensis (XII cent.),[212] and Sicardus Cremonensis (1215).[213] Among the exegetes of the following centuries mention may be made of Erasmus (1536),[214] Calvin (1564),[215] Grotius (1645),[216] Hammond (1660),[217] Vitringa (ca. 1700),[218] Burkitt (1703),[219] Locke (1704),[220] and Bengel (1751).[221]

[206] MPL, 83, 311, In Ex. 46: Per propitiatorium . . . ipse Christus insinuatur. MPL, 82, 544, Etymol. XV: Propitiatorium: quasi propitiationis oratorium.

[207] MPL, 91, 404, De Tabern. I: Propitiatorium non aliud quam Dominum Salvatorem . . . designat.

[208] MPL, 108, 414, In Lev. V: Ipse [Christus] est enim verum et intelligibile propitiatorium.

[209] MPL, 134, 777, Ad Hebr.: Propitiatorium quippe non aliud quam Dominum Salvatorem . . . designat.

[210] MPG, 118, 385, Ad Rom.: *ἡ τοῦ Κυρίου σὰρξ ἡ περικαλύπτουσα τὴν ἑαυτοῦ θεότητα ἱλαστήριον γέγονε τῶν ἡμετέρων ἀνομιῶν.*

[211] MPG, 124, 388, Ad Rom.: *εἰ τὸ ἱλαστήριον τὸ νομικόν, τύπος ὂν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοιαύτην εἶχεν ἰσχύν, πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἡ ἀλήθεια.*

[212] MPL, 167, 702, In Ex. VI: Propitiatorium namque nobis idem incarnatus Deus est, sed per passionem et mortem suam.

[213] MPL, 213, 224, Mitrale, V: Per propitiatorium incarnatus Dominus figuratur.

[214] Critici Sacri, VII, 659.

[215] Comm. in Pauli Ep., 28.

[216] Opera Theol. III, 697.

[217] Paraphrase on N. T., 400.

[218] Opera, IV, 55.

[219] Notes on N. T.

[220] Paraphrase on Rom., 305.

[221] Gnomon of N. T., 48-49.

2. More than 25 scholars favor the meaning expiator, propitiator or reconciliator; among them: Haymon (853),[222] Abelard (1142),[223] Peter Blesensis (ca. 1200),[224] Bonaventure (1274),[225] Vatablus (1547),[226] Estius (1613),[227] and Pareus (ca. 1650).[228] To these may be added Tirinus (1636),[229] Cornelius a Lapide (1637),[230] Menochius (1655),[231] and others who render ἱλαστήριον by expiator, propitiator or reconciliator shading it with the idea of an expiating and propitiating victim.

3. The interpretation of the Pauline ἱλαστήριον as expiatory or propitiatory sacrifice or victim is proposed by at least 10 commentators, all of them living in the second half of the eighteenth century. Some are Calmet,[232] Koppe,[233] Elsner,[234] Kypke,[235] and Clericus.[236]

4. A few later scholars lean towards ἱλαστήριον as something that expiates or propitiates, or as a means of expiation or propitiation. This is held by Stephanus,[237] Castalio,[238] Alting,[239] Diodatus [240] and others.

[222] MPL, 117, 392, Ad Rom.: Filium suum proposuit Deus Pater . . . propitiatorem et reconciliatorem.

[223] MPL, 178, 833, Ad Rom.: Quem proposuit nobis Deus Pater propitiationem, id est, reconciliatorem.

[224] MPL, 207, 926, De Char., 26: Deus Filium suum nobis propitiatorem constituit.

[225] Opera, III, 401: Quem proposuit Deus propitiatorem.

[226] Critici Sacri, VII, 660: Quem Deus . . . decrevit reconciliatorem.

[227] Comm. in Rom., 70; Probabilius est hic accipi . . . ut propitiatorem significet seu reconciliatorem.

[228] Opera Theol., 88: Teneamus . . . Christum constitutum a Deo ἱλαστήριον, propitiatorem.

[229] In S. S. Comm. IV, 491: Propitiationem, id est, propitiatorem vel victimam propitiantem et placantem hominibus Deum.

[230] Comm. in S. S., XVIII, 74: Propitiator, scilicet, victima propitians et placans Deum hominibus.

[231] Comm. in S. S., II, 627: Propitiationem, id est, propitiatorem, scilicet victimam propitiantem et placantem Deum hominibus.

[232] Comm. in V. et N. T., VIII, 66: Victima expiationis.

[233] N. T. Graece, IV, 74: Victima expiatoria.

[234] Observ. Sacrae, II, 20: Expiatorium sacrificium.

[235] Observ. Sacrae, I, 161: Sacrificium expiatorium.

[236] Epist. S. Apostolorum, 30: Piacularis victima.

[237] Critici Sacri, VII, 665: Placamentum.

[238] Interprete Biblia, 214: Placamentum.

[239] Comm. in X Capita ad Rom., 69: Placamentum.

[240] Annotations on the Bible, III: Means of expiation and reconciliation.

The traditional Greek patristic interpretation of Christ as the reality of the O. T. type was therefore preserved and copied more generally than any other. Some exegetes admit the double element of expiation and propitiation and others select either. The idea of sacrifice is considered essential to the term.

Recapitulation and Conclusion of the Historical Part

Having traced the history of the Pauline ἱλαστήριον through all its stages we are in a position to pass judgment on the net results and their value.

Undoubtedly the outstanding feature of the historical investigation is the fact that at all times the majority of scholars interpreted the Pauline term in Rom. III, 25 as designating Christ the antitype of the O. T. ἱλαστήριον. In Him was realized all which the type in the Holy of Holies symbolized. Patristic interpretation, the Greek particularly, refers to the O. T. ἱλαστήριον as the special *locality* where, by sprinkling the blood of the sin-offering, expiation was made for the sins of the Israelites and propitiation of God was effected, and where His presence was manifested. While some modern commentators explain the O. T. ἱλαστήριον as describing a locality, it was seen that present day exegesis is by no means agreed as to the essential presence of the elements of expiation and propitiation.

Two important questions now present themselves for solution. 1) Whence comes the word ἱλαστήριον with its notion of locality as interpreted by patristic writers? 2) Are the elements of expiation, propitiation, sacrifice, and divine presence essentially and necessarily included in the current meaning of ἱλάσκεσθαι and its derivatives, or are they peculiar to the κοινὴ διάλεκτος? In order to answer these questions satisfactorily an investigation of profane as well as biblical literature is necessary.

PART II—EXEGETICAL

CHAPTER III

Historico-literary Investigation of ΙΛΑΣΚΕΣΘΑΙ and its Derivatives

I. *In the Hellenic World*

Greek patristic literature, although correctly placed in a class by itself, does not constitute a linguistic break, but must be considered as a continuation of the literary past, namely, the literature of the classic Greek world. This past, therefore, may not be ignored and, in order to establish precisely the meaning of St. Paul's term, we must examine the root-verb ἱλάσκεσθαι and its cognates from its earliest usage in extant Greek literature. From modern authors we gather some general ideas of what we may expect. Thus C. M. Kerr[1] writes that "the root ideas of the term imply that he who propitiates feels himself in some manner to be lacking or at fault, and that the favour of him who is propitiated is worth the gaining". In other words, he who propitiates desires previously to expiate for his faults in order to effect reconciliation. The expiation of sin among the Greeks, as A. Fairbanks[2] very significantly says, must be considered from these three angles: "(a) the purification from the taint of evil, (b) the allaying of Divine anger caused by intentional or unintentional disregard of what is due to the gods, and (c) the restoration of a man who has transgressed some moral law to harmony with the gods. The emphasis on these three points of view varies, but from Homer onward they are all three present". Hence in examining profane examples our special attention must be directed to the presence or absence of any of these three points.

Homer, in the lengthy narrative on the abduction of Chryseis, the daughter of Chryses, uses forms of ἱλάσκεσθαι, which indicate expiatory and propitiatory notions. Chryses comes to ransom his daughter held captive by Agamemnon, but his proffered ransom is not accepted, neither is his daughter returned. Chryses supplicates the aid of Apollo who is angered at the conduct of Agamemnon. The god sends destructive arrows into Agamemnon's

[1] ERE, X, 393, art. Propitiation (Introductory and Biblical).
[2] ERE, V, 651, art. Expiation and Atonement (Greek).

army, a deadly pestilence visits his people, and countless numbers perish. Seeking to learn the cause of these punishments Agamemnon has recourse to Calchas the seer. The latter informs him that Apollo is angry because he has abducted Chryseis and refuses to return her to her father. If Agamemnon would have the afflictions cease he must return Chryseis and offer up a sacred hecatomb for, "only after we have *ἱλασσάμενοι* may we prevail upon the god—*τότε κέν μιν ἱλασσάμενοι πεπίθοιμεν*".[3] We are told that Agamemnon follows the advice of Calchas. A sacred hecatomb is put on the ship with the maid, and Palides is asked to perform the sacred rites "so that having brought sacrifices you may *ἱλάσσεαι* the far-darting Apollo for us—*ὄφρ' ἡμῖν ἐκάεργον ἱλάσσεαι ἱερὰ ῥέξας*".[4] By sacrifices Palides is to atone for Agamemnon's crime and to procure thus the good graces of Apollo. At home Agamemnon orders the army to be purified and chosen hecatombs of bulls and goats to be sacrificed to Apollo.[5] Chryses is returned to her father, the sacred hecatomb is offered in order that "we may *ἱλασόμεσθα* the lord Apollo—*ἱλασόμεσθα ἄνακτα*".[6] The afflictions cease; a banquet is prepared for the god and the soldiers; and all day long youths sang and *θεὸν ἱλάσκοντο*.[7]

In this narrative the several forms of *ἱλάσκεσθαι* embrace not only the element of propitiation, which is certainly the most conspicuous, but likewise that of expiation. By abducting the daughter of Chryses, Agamemnon incurs the anger of the god. Apollo punishes the entire army and refuses to be reconciled until the guilt of Agamemnon is atoned for. In order to make expiation and propitiation Agamemnon must sacrifice. Accordingly the verb *ἱλάσκεσθαι* itself contains the elements of expiation and propitiation brought about through sacrifice.

The sons of Athens "annually *ἱλάονται* their god in a sumptuous temple by means of bulls and lambs—*ἐν πίονι νηῷ . . . ταύροισι καὶ ἀρνειοῖς ἱλάονται . . . περιτελλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν*".[8] This act must have been a specific ceremony apart from the other frequent sacrificial offerings to the gods. As such it may be accepted as a ceremony by which through sacrifices the people hoped to expiate their faults and wrong-doings of the past year, to propitiate the god, and thus obtain his favor for the ensuing year. It is rel-

[3] Il., I, 100.
[4] Il., I, 147.
[5] Cf. Il., I, 313-316.
[6] Il., I, 444.
[7] Il., I, 472.
[8] Il., II, 549-551.

evant also that the sacrifices are affixed to a particular place, i. e., the temple, the special abode of the deity.

Hector returns from the battle field to Troy, there to assemble the Trojan women in the temple of Minerva in order to supplicate the aid of the goddess in the fight with the Greeks. Not finding her at home, Hector inquires of a maid whether his wife also has gone "to the temple where the women ἱλάσκονται the dreaded goddess—ἐς Ἀθηναίης ἐξοίχεται, ἔνθα . . . δεινὴν θεὸν ἱλάσκονται".[9] The meaning of ἱλάσκονται in this passage would seem to be bestowal of the goddess' favor. But, besides, the Trojans seem to fear her wrath in the conflict because of misdeeds, and therefore they repair to the temple to expiate their faults and to placate the goddess. Again, these acts are performed in the temple and they offer the goddess a most beautiful robe with the promise that, if they conquer the Greeks, they will offer as sacrifice twelve yearling heifers that have never borne the yoke.[10]

Nestor sends his son Telemachus on an important mission to Menelaus at Sparta. Before the departure Nestor commands the sacrifice of a heifer "so that we may ἱλάσσομ' Pallas the first of the gods—ὄφρ' ἤ τοι πρώτιστα θεῶν ἱλάσσομ' Ἀθήνην".[11] The intention probably is that of seeking the favor of the goddess so that the son's journey may be without mishap. But, at all events, we notice that sacrifice enters into the notion of ἱλάσκεσθαι.

We may conclude from this that Homer used forms of ἱλάσκεσθαι for both to expiate and to propitiate, and these results were sought by means of sacrifice generally offered in a sacred place. No example of any substantive or adjective form can be adduced.

The situation in Herodotus (443 B. C.) is similar. He relates how Croesus sent messengers to the various oracles consulting them about the manner of proceeding against his enemies. Of all the answers only that of the Delphic oracle was accepted by Croesus who, accordingly, "ἱλάσκετο the god with many sacrifices—θυσίῃσι μεγάλῃσι τὸν ἐν Δελφοῖσι θεὸν ἱλάσκετο". The offerings consisted of three thousand sacrificial beasts and many gifts of gold and silver.[12] At first reading the act of Croesus can be taken as one of thanksgiving only. But it must also be considered as an act whereby the god's favor is sought in the coming difficulties; neither is the desire to atone for any possible misdeeds entirely excluded.

[9] Il., VI, 379-380.
[10] Cf. Il., VI, 297-311.
[11] Od., III, 419.
[12] Hist., I, 50.

Important is that all these acts are procured only by means of sacrifices and offerings.

The Lacedaemonians had suffered continual defeat at the hands of the Tegeans. The Delphic oracle was asked which one of the gods they must propitiate—*τίνα ἂν θεῶν ἱλασάμενοι* in order to prevail against the Tegeans. The oracle ordered them to remove to Sparta the bones of Orestes, the son of Agamemnon.[13] Evidently the Lacedaemonians were conscious of some guilt and anxious to know how to expiate this guilt and be again restored to the god's favor. Instead of the usual means of expiation and propitiation which is sacrifice, we have here as equivalent the restoration of the bones of Orestes.

According to Scythian tradition four implements of gold — a plough, a yoke, a battle-axe, and a drinking cup—fell from the sky. Three brothers were at that time ruling the land. The two oldest went to pick up the instruments, but these took fire and blazed. When Colaxais, the youngest, approached, the flames disappeared; he picked up the instruments and carried them into his home, where they were carefully guarded and honored. "Annually the Scythians come and propitiate with great sacrifices—*θυσίῃσι μεγάλῃσι ἱλασκόμενοι μετέρχονται ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔτος*".[14] This annual ceremony must have been intended as an atonement for the guilt of the two older brothers, and the good graces of the divinely worshipped golden implements were obtained through sacrifices at the place where they were guarded and honored.

Pheidippides, an Athenian by birth, was sent to Sparta. On his return he related how on the way he met the god Pan, who bade him ask the Athenians why they neglected him who had always been kindly disposed towards them. Believing in the truth of this report, "the Athenians erected a temple to Pan and propitiated him yearly with sacrifices and a torch race—*ἱδρύσαντο . . . Πανὸς ἱρόν, καὶ αὐτὸν ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς ἀγγελίης θυσίῃσι ἐπετείῃσι καὶ λαμπάδι ἱλάσκονται*".[15] Thus they strove to make good their past neglect and to secure the future favor of Pan. The ceremonies consisted principally in the sacrifices offered in his temple. Expiation and propitiation with the sacrificial notion clearly appear.

In answer to an inquiry of the Delphians concerning the safety of the Greeks, the oracle bade them pray to the winds who would give Greece good service. In gratitude the Delphians raised an

[13] Hist., I, 67. [14] Hist., IV, 7. [15] Hist., VI, 105.

altar to the winds—*τοῖσι ἀνέμοισι βωμόν*, worshipped them with sacrifices—*θυσίῃσί σφεας μετήϊσαν*, and even "*νῦν τοὺς ἀνέμους ἱλάσκονται*".[16] This propitiation is the fruit of sacrifice at a special place, the altar.

While these references do not always clearly allude to the notion of expiation, it is patently presupposed. When propitiation is made and reconciliation brought about, it shows previous consciousness of a need to atone for misdeeds so as not to lose the favor of the gods or those honored as gods. The conclusion is warranted that in Herodotus the notions of sacrifice and propitiation are quite manifest while that of expiation is only inferred. *Ἱλαστήριον* as adjective or noun is not found in Herodotus.

Xenophon (401 B. C.) relates how Cyrus, preparatory to moving his army, sacrificed to the gods in hope that they would lend aid in leading, advising, and assisting in the conflict. Immediately upon arriving at his destination he hastened "to propitiate the earth by libations and the gods by sacrifices—*γῆν ἱλάσκετο χοαῖς καὶ θεοὺς θυσίαις*".[17] Doubting the veracity of the oracle at Delphi, Croesus consulted it several times. His incredulity constituted an affront to Apollo. To make expiation for this and to allay his anger Croesus sent to the oracle "numerous votive offerings, much silver, and ordered very many sacrifices—*πολλὰ . . . πέμπων ἀναθήματα χρυσᾶ, πολλὰ δ' ἀργυρᾶ, πάμπολλα δὲ θύων ἐξιλασάμην ποτὲ αὐτόν*".[18] In these examples the fundamental elements attached to the root of (*ἐξ*)*ιλάσκεσθαι* are evident. It must be added that the word *ἱλαστήριον* is not used by Xenophon.

Apollonius of Rhodes (200 B. C.) tells us how Mopsus the seer directs Aeson's son to go up to the temple on the hill Dindymum, there "to propitiate the mother (Rhea) of all the blessed gods—*ἱλάξασθαι μητέρα συμπάντων μακάρων*".[19] The act of the youth is to be taken not merely as worship of the goddess but also as propitiatory. It is performed in the temple and, while the means are not mentioned, we must assume sacrifice or offering of some sort. Among the scholia to Apollonius of Rhodes there occurs a word which brings us in closer contact with the *ἱλαστήριον* question, for we meet a form of the adjective. In explanation of *λωφήϊα ἱερά*, the scholiast says "*τουτέστιν ἐξιλαστήρια καὶ καταπαυστήρια τῆς*

[16] Hist., VII, 178.
[17] Cyr., III, 3, 22.
[18] Cyr., VII, 2. 19.
[19] Argonautica, I, 1093.

ὀργῆς"[20] i. e., sacrifices that brought relief, namely, expiatory (sacrifices) and those appeasing the anger (of the gods). Here also the two fundamental elements are contained although the expiatory notion is more prominent. Is the appearance of such a similar form to the substantive at this late period only incidental or is it, perhaps, to be attributed to the influence of a source which we must yet investigate?

In PLUTARCH (80 A. D.) we read that Androgeos, son of King Minos of Crete, was treacherously murdered within the confines of Attica. Angered by this deed Minos sought to avenge the death of his son. He harassed the Atticans and even heaven sent pestilence to the people and barrenness upon their land. Consequently the inhabitants consulted their god who assured them, if they appeased Minos and became reconciled to him—*ἱλασαμένοις τὸν Μίνω καὶ διαλλαγεῖσι*, the evils would abate. Wherefore they agreed to send Minos a tribute of seven youths and seven maidens every ninth year.[21] The guilt of the murder of the king's son demanded expiation. This was carried out by sending the youths and maidens as offerings to Minos; thus the latter was propitiated and reconciliation brought about between the king and the Atticans.

In Plutarch is found another characteristic development of the root of *ἱλάσκεσθαι* in profane Greek. It is the substantive *ἱλασμός* and its use, perhaps, is not entirely accidental. He relates that Athens was agitated by the Cylonian pollution caused by the unjust murders of Cylon and his followers. Superstitious fears and strange appearances were alarming the people and the seers declared that the usual sacrifices indicated defilements of guilt which demanded purifications. The Athenians summoned Epimenides of Phaestus, a wise man, who brought immediate succor. Most important was that by *ἱλασμοῖς* and purifications — *τὸ δὲ μέγιστον, ἱλασμοῖς τισι καὶ καθαρμοῖς*—he cleansed the city, made it heedful of justice, and more inclined to concord.[22] To kill Cylon and his followers at the altar of Athene was an insult to the goddess demanding expiation and reconciliation. Therefore *ἱλασμοῖς* expresses the means made use of to these ends. Doubtless they were sacrifices or offerings at the altar or the temple of the goddess. Camillus, on setting out against the Veii, had vowed, if successful, to consecrate one-tenth of the spoils to the Delphian god. After his victory he neglected to make good that promise. Later on he

[20] Schol. Argonaut., Ed. Brunck, II, 165.

[21] Theseus, I, 15.

[22] Solon, XII, 5.

referred the matter to the seers who announced that "the anger of the gods demanded ἱλασμοῦ and thanksgivings—*θεῶν μῆνιν ἱλασμοῦ καὶ χαριστηρίων δεομένην*".[23] By not keeping his vow Camillus incurred the anger of the gods. To remove this guilt, expiation was to be made before he might hope to propitiate the anger of the gods. The ἱλασμοῦ hints at the means employed; what they were, Plutarch does not say, but we may safely understand sacrifices or offerings. Pausanias had raped a Byzantine virgin and then killed her. After this outrage he had no peace of mind. In his sleep he frequently heard a voice telling him to go and atone for his crime—*βαῖνε, δίκης ἄσσον· μάλα τοὶ κακὸν ἀνδράσιν ὕβρις*. Repairing to the psychopompeion at Heraclea he recalled the soul of the girl by ἱλασμοῖς and by sacrifices to the dead—*ἱλασμοῖς τισι καὶ χοαῖς*. She foretold that in punishment for his crime he would have to die.[24] Here we see that by means of sacrifices Pausanias made expiation and propitiation; yet the penalty of death remained.

Plutarch's verb and noun usages of *ἱλάσκεσθαι* include the element of expiation and that of propitiation; the means were sacrifices or offerings at a special place. Of interest is the substantive *ἱλασμός*, whose signification must be that of means of expiation and propitiation.

Summary

Briefly summarized the study of profane Greek literature has shown that *ἱλάσκεσθαι* means not only to propitiate but also to expiate; these two notions are inseparably connected with the root. Ordinarily these acts of expiation and propitiation were produced by means of sacrifice or offering in a temple or some other sacred place. With Fairbanks[25] it may be said that the expiation of sin consisted "first, in setting right one's attitude toward the gods; secondly, in appeasing the Divine anger", which signifies that when profane writers employed the term *ἱλάσκεσθαι* and its cognates they had reference to the act of expiating sin and of propitiating the anger of the gods.

Of paramount importance is the fact that in profane Greek we find no example of the substantive *ἱλαστήριον*. Ἱλασμός, which signifies the means of expiation as well as propitiation, is employed only in later Greek literature, while the adjective *ἐξιλαστήριος* is found in the scholia of a late writer.

[23] Camillus, VII, 5. [24] Mor., 2, 555, C.
[25] ERE, V, 653, art., Expiation and Atonement (Greek).

Corollary

We have arrived at the conclusion that in the Greek religious world of thought ἱλάσκεσθαι is a terminus technicus for the restoration of the natural relation, especially between an offended god and the offending party. The fundamental meaning of this technical term was found to embrace three elements: a) propitiation on the part of the one offended, b) removal or forgiveness of the offence, c) offering or sacrifice as the means of accomplishing expiation and propitiation. The test for the correctness of this analysis is furnished by other instances in Greek literature. There are many examples in which the process of reconciliation between the offended god and sinful man by means of offering or sacrifice is described without the use of ἱλάσκεσθαι and its cognates. A few will suffice to illustrate.

We read in Homer that Aegisthus, after seducing Clytemnestra, the wife of Agamemnon, led her away to his own palace. Aegisthus felt that this act was not so much an offence against Agamemnon, but more so a sin against the gods whose anger he also feared. Hence he sought to receive forgiveness for his sin and to regain the favor of the gods "by offering many a victim's thigh upon the sacred altars of the gods and by hanging within their temples many a gift of ornaments wrought in gold—*πολλὰ δὲ μηρία κῆε θεῶν ἱεροῖς ἐπὶ βωμοῖς, πολλὰ δ' ἀγάλματ' ἀνῆψεν, ὑφάσματά τε χρυσόν τε*".[26]

In *Od.* IV it is related that Menelaus was unwillingly detained on the shores of Egypt because "he had not brought the sacrifice of chosen hecatombs as the gods required" (352-353). For this neglect the gods punish Menelaus by not permitting favorable winds for his return journey. To the question of a goddess why he does not depart, he replies: "I must have sinned against the immortal dwellers of the high heaven—*μέλλω ἀθανάτους ἀλιτέσθαι, οἳ οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχουσιν*" (377-378). The goddess again tells him this punishment is being inflicted because "he should have offered first the accustomed sacrifice to Jove and the other gods" (472-473). He resolves therefore to atone for his neglect in order to remove the anger of the gods and to secure favorable winds. "He offered the prescribed sacrifices and appeased the anger of the gods—*ἔρεξα τελήεσσας ἑκατόμβας . . . κατέπαυσα θεῶν χόλον*" (582-583). In this narrative it is obvious that Menelaus had to expiate

[26] Od., III, 273-274.

for his utter disregard of the usual sacrifices to the gods before he could hope to propitiate their incurred anger and to obtain their good favor. He accomplished all by bringing the necessary sacrifices.

Ulysses, being shipwrecked with his companions, found refuge on the island of the Sun. A beautiful herd of cattle, which were held sacred and under the protection of the sun god, grazed on the island. Ulysses strictly forbade his companions to slay any of the herd for the oracle had foretold that evil would befall them if they did. When the supplies were diminished, unmindful of the threat the companions slaughtered the best of the herd. They thought to allay the anger of the god by vowing that, after returning to Ithaca, "they would build to the sun god a sumptuous temple and endow it with many votive offerings" (Od. XII, 346-347). The sun god had been offended, so much so that the offence permitted of no expiation, neither was the anger of the god propitiated. In punishment, as the narrative concludes, their ship on the return voyage was cast upon the rocks and all perished but Ulysses. Although the evil doers are here not successful in their wish to expiate their guilt and to propitiate the anger of the god, the general belief is evident that they could do so by erecting the temple and endowing it with votive offerings.

In *Hist.* VI, 138-140 Herodotus relates how the Pelasgians carried off a large number of Athenian women and kept them at Lemnos as concubines. Fearing that the Athenian youths would eventually overpower their own children, the Pelasgians killed the Athenian women and their sons. Punishment for this act immediately followed. The lands refused to bring forth fruits, the Pelasgian population decreased, and their flocks and herds increased more slowly than before. Sorely pressed they sent men to Delphi and the oracle informed them that they must make whatever satisfaction the Athenians demand —*Αθηναίοισι δίκας διδόναι ταύτας, τὰς ἂν αὐτοὶ Αθηναῖοι δικάσωσι.* They required the Pelasgians to give up their country and this also took place. The giving up of their country served as the offering which the Pelasgians had to bring in order to propitiate the anger of the Athenians.

In *Hist.* IX, 93-94 we read that the Apolloniats had a flock of sheep which were sacred to the sun. The noblest citizens were selected to guard the sheep from harm during the night. When a certain Evenius was chosen to keep the watch he, one night, fell asleep; wolves came and destroyed sixty of the sheep. When the

loss was discovered, the Apolloniats brought Evenius to trial and condemned him to lose his eyes. After he was blinded the sheep had no young and the land ceased to bear its accustomed harvests. Forthwith the Apolloniats consulted the oracles at Delphi and Dodona. The answer was that the gods themselves had sent the wolves and that they would continue punishing the Apolloniats until they made to Evenius whatever atonement he asked—*πρὶν ἢ δίκας δῶσι τῶν ἐποίησαν ταύτας, τὰς ἂν αὐτὸς ἕληται καὶ δικαιοῖ.* Evenius demanded certain productive lands and a well furnished home, and these were bought for him. This story points out again the elements of expiation and propitiation; both were effected by the offering of the lands and the home to Evenius.

Euripides (b. 480 B. C.) offers two very expressive examples. In *Medea* it is recorded how Jason deserts his wife Medea and takes to himself the royal daughter of Creon. The anger of Medea is aroused and she murders her two sons. She is likewise the cause of the deaths of Creon and his daughter. Jason recalls to Medea her own sinful life and she becomes conscious of her guilt. In reply she remarks: "I will institute a solemn festival and offering to make atonement for this impious murder—*σεμνὴν ἑορτὴν καὶ τέλη προσάψομεν . . . ἀντὶ τοῦδε δυσσεβοῦς φόνου* (1382-1383). The desire of expiating the guilt of crime is clearly seen and with it also there goes the wish to become reconciled; the festival and offering are the means made use of to accomplish the desired effect.

In the play, *Iphigenia in Aulis,* the substance of the narrative is the following. Agamemnon had pursued a hind into the sacred precincts of Artemis and there killed it. He thereby incurred the anger of the goddess and in punishment she prevented Agamemnon's sailing from Aulis to Troy. Eager to know the cause of his detention at Aulis Agamemnon seeks the advice of Calchas the seer. He announces that Artemis is angry and will not grant favorable winds until Agamemnon sacrifices his daughter Iphigenia to Artemis (*Ἰφιγένειαν ἣν ἔσπειρ' ἐγὼ Ἀρτέμδι θῦσαι*—90-91). No expression of humble repentance, no pleading on Agamemnon's part was capable of changing the decree of the goddess. Therefore in order to expiate his guilt and to procure the good winds from the goddess Agamemnon decides to bring his daughter as an expiatory and propitiatory sacrifice.[27] Favored with good winds they then set sail. It is easy to distinguish the presence of the three elements in this narrative.

[27] Cf. 1570-1577.

II. *In the LXX and Jewish Tradition*

1. In the LXX

It is possible that the characteristic developments of the root of ἱλάσκεσθαι in profane Greek may be only incidental. But it is highly probable that they are due to a special factor manifesting its influence at about 200 B. C. When we see that the word ἱλαστήριον, which practically never occurred in early profane literature, is employed in another world of thought with astonishing frequency, the problem receives added interest. From the standpoint of patristic interpretation we are forced to suppose a new agency which was powerful enough to create from current ideas a new terminology in later hellenic literature; and at patristic times this terminology had become so common that it plainly was not a problematical or hazy notion but an every-day idea. Consequently in the present question patristic literature is the historia docens, pointing out the world from which this new agency exercised its influence. By the constant appeal to the LXX as the source for the term ἱλαστήριον, the Fathers clearly show that the new power was the LXX. Accordingly, an inquiry into its use and the meaning it attaches to ἱλάσκεσθαι and the derivatives is of utmost importance.

a) The Verb

Verbal forms of (ἐξ)ιλάσκεσθαι occur more than 160 times in the LXX. At least 115 of these are the equivalent of כִּפֶּר; more than 20 cases have no Hebrew equivalent, while in the remaining cases (ἐξ)ιλάσκεσθαι is the equivalent for Hebrew verbs meaning to forgive, pardon, expiate, conciliate, cleanse, free from sin, appease. Let us examine the meaning of (ἐξ)ιλάσκεσθαι—כִּפֶּר to find out what elements are included.

Jacob, conscious of having wronged his brother, is in mortal dread of meeting Esau. Therefore, he sends his servants with gifts in advance, saying: I will appease his face—ἐξιλάσομαι τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ—אֲכַפְּרָה פָּנָיו.[27a] The meaning is that Jacob, conscious of his guilt of wrong doing, hopes by gifts to expiate this guilt, to propitiate his brother's anger, and to become reconciled to him.

[27a] Gen. XXXII, 20.

After the golden calf episode before going up the mountain to God, Moses says to the people: I shall make expiation—ἐξιλάσωμαι—אֲכַפְּרָה for your sins.[27b] This was effected either by the intercession of Moses (v. 31), or by his offer to die for his people (v. 32). The crime of idolatry through worship of the golden calf required expiation; a wrathful God had to be propitiated. Moses accomplished both either by interceding or by offering to die for his people.

If a murder had been committed and the murderer was not discovered the ancients of the nearest city where the murdered body was found killed a heifer over running water and washed their hands over it to protest their innocence. In prayer they besought God not to lay this murder to their charge and to that of the people, and "the blood (guilt) shall be expiated for them—ἐξιλασθήσεται αὐτοῖς τὸ αἷμα—נְכַפֶּר לָהֶם הַדָּם".[28] The guilt of blood rested upon the land and the people. The prayer of the ancients with the sacrifice of the unblemished heifer tended to make expiation and to propitiate God, so that He would show Himself favorable to the people.

When the Lord appeared to Samuel in the temple He spoke of the sins of Heli's sons and told Samuel that the iniquity of Heli's house shall not be expiated—ἐξιλασθήσεται—יְתֻכַּפֵּר with victims nor offerings for ever.[29] Here the allusion is clear. The sins of Heli's sons brought the curse of God upon Heli himself, and the Lord did not accept victims or offerings in expiation for these sins, neither was the Lord propitiated, for Heli and his sons were killed.

David consulted the Lord concerning the cause of a three year famine and was told it was a punishment because Saul and his bloody house had slain the Gabaonites to whom the Israelites had sworn protection. Calling them David asks: What shall I do for you and wherewith shall I make expiation—ἐξιλάσωμαι—אֲכַפֵּר that you may bless the inheritance of the Lord.[30] The Gabaonites reply (v. 4) that it is not a question of silver or gold between themselves and Saul, but that they desire to destroy the offspring of the man who crushed and oppressed them unjustly (v. 5). Therefore they ask for two of Saul's sons and five of his grandsons that they may crucify them to the Lord in Gabaa of Saul (v. 6). Their

[27b] Ex. XXXII, 30.
[28] Deut. XXI, 8.
[29] I Kgs. III, 14.
[30] II Kgs. XXI, 3.

request is granted, the seven are crucified and the Gabaonites are satisfied. The injury done them by Saul is expiated by the death of his offspring. God also is placated, for He showed mercy again to the land after these things (v. 14). The guilt of the blood shed by Saul rests upon his family, and its penal consequences affect the entire nation. Therefore, the mercy of God is not shown to the land until the guilt of these murders is removed.

A number of other references indicate the same twofold meaning although the element of propitiation stands in the foreground. Thus we read that the Lord is merciful and He will be propitious—ἱλάσεται—כַּפֵּר to sinners.[31] Again, deliver us, O Lord, on account of Thy name and be propitious—ἱλάσθητι—כַּפֵּר.[32]

In Leviticus[33] and Numbers[34] forms of ἐξιλάσκεσθαι occur more than 60 times in connection with the sacrifices and offerings prescribed by the law. Strikingly frequent is its occurrence in the ceremonies laid down for the ritual observance of the day of Atonement (Lev. XVI). In the majority of these cases the verb is followed by περὶ (expiate and propitiate for some one), and usually the priests, Levites or High Priest perform these rites by means of sacrifices.

While the examples from the LXX stress the element of expiation in the meaning of (ἐξ)ιλάσκεσθαι and its cognates, the element of propitiation is certainly included. In profane Greek the idea of propitiation appears to be more conspicuous; yet the idea of expiation is also essentially contained in (ἐξ)ιλάσκεσθαι. As S. R. Driver[35] says, "the difference marks a distinction between the heathen and the Biblical points of view; though the idea of propitiating God may be involved in the phrases used in the OT, it is much less prominent than in heathen writers". In reference to the LXX meaning of (ἐξ)ιλάσκεσθαι—כִּפֶּר, he says: "The expiatory rite has, no doubt, as its ultimate object the restoration of God's favour, and the worshipper's forgiveness", and hence "though the idea of propitiation is, no doubt, involved in *kipper*, it must not be unduly pressed; and the idea most distinctly conveyed by the word was probably that of 'expiation'". The same writer[36] states in the beginning of his article that "kipper

[31] Ps. LXXVII, 38. [32] Ps. LXXVIII, 9.
[33] Cf. IV, 20, 26, 31, 35; V, 6, 10, 13, 16, 18, 26; XIV, 18, 19, 20, 29, 31.
[34] Cf. VIII, 12, 19, 21; XV, 25, 28; XVI, 46, 47; XXVIII, 22, 30.
[35] ERE, V, 658, art. Expiation and Atonement (Hebrew).
[36] Op cit., 653.

is the Heb. word corresponding to both 'make expiation' and 'make atonement'". The phraseology of J. Orr[37] is similar. Speaking of (ἐξ)ιλάσκεσθαι—כִּפֶּר in the LXX, he writes: "Both ideas seem to be implied here; the offence is cancelled or annulled, . . . and God is rendered propitious. . . . The means by which this was effected under the Law was ordinarily sacrifice".

b) The Adjective

The only adjectival use of the term is found in Ex. xxv, 17, where the words "thou shalt make a כַּפֹּרֶת of pure gold" are rendered by the LXX "ποιήσεις ἱλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα χρυσίου καθαροῦ". Concerning this example Deissmann[38] correctly remarks that the LXX "haben den Begriff kappôreth ganz richtig verstanden und zwar auch als Breviloquenz", namely, "für kappôreth setzen sie ἱλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα, weil es sich um eine Platte handelte, die irgendwie als Deckel der Bundeslade diente". The adjective ἱλαστήριον indicates that this "Platte" had something to do with expiation and propitiation. The reason is clarified by the consideration of the substantive.

c) The Substantive

In contrast to profane Greek literature the LXX writers use the substantive frequently, no less than 27 times. Of this number 21 are renderings for כַּפֹּרֶת;[39] 5 for עֲזָרָה;[40] and in Amos IX, 1 its use is evidently the result of a mistaken reading of כַּפֹּרֶת for כַּפְתּוֹר.

In the 21 cases the term is employed to designate the special locality above the ark where God manifested His presence to the Israelites, and where, by the sprinkling of the sacrificial blood, expiation was made for the sins of the Israelites, and God declared Himself placated. That the ἱλαστήριον had a particular purpose

[37] HDB, 765, art. Propitiation.
[38] Op. cit., 207.
[39] They occur in Ex. XXV, 18, 19, 20 (twice), 21, 22; Ex. XXXI, 7; Ex. XXXV, 12; Ex. XXXVII, 6, 7, 8, 9 (twice); Lev. XVI, 2 (twice), 13, 14 (twice), 15 (twice); Num. VII, 89. In Ex. XXVI, 34 the LXX read τῷ καταπετάσματι for כַּפֹּרֶת due, as Deissmann (Op. cit., 207) says, to a faulty reading of פָּרֹכֶת for כַּפֹּרֶת.
[40] Ez. XLIII, 14 (3 times), 17, 20.

and was not intended merely to close the ark, is implied by the fact that it was made of solid gold while the ark itself was only of wood overlaid with gold. Deissmann holds that in the LXX it means "ein (Versöhnendes oder) Sühnendes, (Versöhnungs- oder) Sühnungsgegenstand oder -mittel".[41] Thus Deissmann, while admitting the presence of either, would fain eliminate the propitiatory element. But our position is that both are essentially and necessarily always involved. Nor is it probable, as Deissmann argues, that ἱλαστήριον merely signifies a means or circumstance of expiation and propitiation, because both profane as well as biblical Greek examples have made it clear that ordinarily the means by which these acts are effected is sacrifice. The correct meaning of the word is suggested by the Holy of Holies being called the house of expiation and propitiation. In I Par. XXVIII, 11 the LXX does not use ἱλαστήριον, but explains כַּפֹּרֶת by "τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ ἐξιλασμοῦ—בֵּית הַכַּפֹּרֶת", and in v. 20 it is again styled "τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἱλασμοῦ". The question arises whether this is only accidental or whether it reveals a right understanding of כַּפֹּרֶת by the LXX? By defining the Holy of Holies as the house of expiation and propitiation the LXX writers undoubtedly wished to show the all-importance of the O. T. ἱλαστήριον and also to offer a clue to its correct interpretation. If כַּפֹּרֶת is the house of expiation and propitiation, then ἱλαστήριον designates the particular place within the Holy of Holies where these acts were performed. It is likewise to be observed that ἐξιλασμός and ἱλασμός are employed indiscriminately in the above quoted example. The LXX employs the substantive (ἐξ)ιλασμός more than 25 times and in all cases it implies both elements. Special attention may be called to Lev. XXIII, 27-28 where the Atonement day is twice designated as ἡμέρα ἐξιλασμοῦ—יוֹם הַכִּפֻּרִים. The Vulgate uses two distinct expressions. The first in v. 27 is rendered "dies expiationum" while in v. 28 the Vulgate reads "dies propitiationis".[42] Evidently the Vulgate finds both ideas expressed in ἐξιλασμός.

What now must be the conclusion? Does (ἐξ)ιλάσκεσθαι mean to expiate *or* to propitiate, or to expiate *and* to propitiate? The conclusion must be that both elements are fundamentally and substantially always included; if sin was removed then God was again

[41] Op. cit., 208.
[42] Vigouroux, La Sainte Bible, I, 597.

rendered favorable and propitious to the Israelites. The act of expiation is followed by propitiation. Modern authors, to a certain extent, recognize the double element, and the following quotation will be in place. After examining the verb כִּפֶּר and its derivatives in the LXX, S. R. Driver [43] concludes: "What, lastly, it may be asked, is the most prominent idea expressed by *kipper?* The ideas of expiation, purification from sin, propitiation, and 'at-one-ment', or reconciliation, are intimately connected; one and the same rite effects them all; and all, if not included in, are at least immediately suggested by, kipper". We maintain that these ideas are not merely suggested, but are essentially and necessarily included. Deissmann is therefore wrong when he insists that the *context* must decide whether the meaning be expiation *or* propitiation. Regarding ἱλαστήριον we conclude that the word originated in the LXX, and that it contains the notions of a) *expiation and* b) *propitiation*; these are accomplished c) *by the sacrificial blood being sprinkled* d) *on a holy and special place* e) *where God was present.* The ἱλαστήριον was not the means whereby expiation and propitiation were effected, but the place where these acts were performed through the sprinkling of the sacrificial blood. The means of expiation and propitiation is expressed by (ἐξ)ιλασμός. The O. T. ἱλαστήριον in itself did not expiate and propitiate, neither did the sacrificial blood in itself bring about these effects; but they resulted only then when the blood was sprinkled on the ἱλαστήριον:— the local connection between the sprinkling of the blood and the ἱλαστήριον was necessary. This local notion, however, lies not in the blood but in ἱλαστήριον. In the LXX, then, we have the agency that was operating between early profane Greek literature and the idiomatic phraseology of the Fathers. How influential this agency was becomes evident from a study of the word in Jewish tradition.

2. In Jewish Tradition

The Talmud and Jewish Atonement day customs offer interesting and important testimony in proving the traditional double element in כִּפֶּר and its derivatives.

a) The Talmud [44]

Sins of man against God the day of Atonement expiates —

[43] ERE, V, 658, art. Expiation and Atonement (Hebrew).

[44] All Talmudic references are taken from Lazarus Goldschmidt, Der Babylonische Talmud, VIII volumes.

יום הכפורים מכפר,[45] but the sins of man against his fellow man it does not expiate—מכפר, until they become reconciled.[46] In the same tract we read that death and the day of Atonement make expiation—מכפרין.[47] The rabbis also ordered the Jew to pray before entering a bath house, lest destruction and sin overtake him. If he should unfortunately happen to sin then he must pray that his death be an expiation—כפרה for all his sins.[48]

When the son of R. Simeon ben Shetah was falsely accused and condemned to death, he said: "If I am guilty may my death not be an expiation—כפרה for all my sins; but if I am innocent may my death serve as expiation—כפרה.[49] Mention is also made of one rabbi who would offer himself as an expiation—כפרה for R. Hija and his sons.[50] Such examples show that the rabbis considered death as an expiation for sin and as a means of effecting propitiation. This is shown more distinctly in the following example. According to Num. xxv, 25-28 if one was guilty of manslaughter and had fled to a city of refuge, he had to dwell there until the death of the High Priest. Thereafter he was again free to return to his own country. The rabbis proposed the question whether the slayer made expiation—מכפרא for his crime by being exiled. They answered in the negative and held that the slayer obtained expiation—מכפרא only through the death of the High Priest.[51] His death must be considered as a sin-offering by which the sins of his people are not only expiated but God is also propitiated and reconciliation is effected.

This brief study shows that in the Talmud stress is laid upon the point of expiation whereas the element of propitiation hardly finds express mention. But the latter idea is necessarily implied for, by desiring to expiate their sins, the Jews sought also to propitiate God and become reconciled to Him; otherwise their act of expiation would have been meaningless. Such is also the view of G. F. Moore[52] on the meaning of כִּפֶּר in the Talmud: "The verb kipper and its derivatives are used, precisely as in the OT, in the sense 'to make propitiation, expiation, procure remission'".

b) Atonement Day Customs of the Middle Ages

No less illuminating are the customs of the Jews in the middle

[45] Joma 85[b].
[46] Ibid.
[47] Joma 86[a].
[48] Berakh. 60[a].
[49] Sanh., 44[b].
[50] Sukkah, 20[b].
[51] Makkoth, 11[b].
[52] EBi, IV, 4226, art. Sacrifice.

ages. Weigand [53] says of the word *kappores* that it is "Jüdische Aussprache des rabbinisch-hebr. kapporeth f. 'Versöhnung, Sühnopfer'". He then states that on the Atonement day the Jews sought to place their sins upon a non-Jew, saying to him: "Sei du meine kapporeth!", which means, "mein Sühnopfer, was dann den Sinn hatte: Stirb du für mich zur Versöhnung mit Gott". In preparation for the day of Atonement, as Sanders [54] relates, the Jews were wont to purchase a rooster "als eine 'Kaporoh' (gleichsam ein Sühnopfer)". He adds that they would swing the fowl over their head three times with the wish that the punishments due them for their sins be transferred to it. Then the rooster was killed. K. Kohler [55] also speaks of this custom and adds that, while swinging the cock around the head, the Jew repeated three times in Hebrew the following: "This be my substitute, my vicarious offering, my atonement. This cock (or hen) shall meet death, but I shall find a long and pleasant life of peace!". The fowl, Kohler remarks elsewhere,[56] was "to be killed in place of the Jew or Jewess who might be guilty of death by his or her sin". This custom, he adds, shows "a deep-rooted desire for some form of atoning sacrifice". These practices are also mentioned by Eisenmenger who writes that during the act of swinging the fowl, besides the other formula, the Jew recites vv. 13, 17, 20 and 21 of Ps. CVII and 23 and 24 of Job XXXIII. He informs us also that if a Jew was too poor to purchase a cock, he went out early in the morning and, giving three or four pence to the first Christian he met, he asked him to be his *capporo,* which means: "Ich soll sterben und habe gesündigt, fahre vor (für) mich in die Hölle, vor (für) Vergebung meiner Sünden und sterbe vor (für) mich".[57] Again, it is customary with the Jews on the Atonement day, according to the same author, when meeting a Christian "das Wort כפרה Cappara oder Capporo, welches eine Versühnung heisset . . . gegen denselben ausstossen",[58] wishing

[53] Deutsches Wörterbuch, I, 987.

[54] Wörterbuch d. deut. Sprache, I, 866.

[55] JE, VII, 435, art. Kapparah. Cf. Bernstein, Jüd. Sprichwörter, 31. He explains כַּפָּרָה as "Kapuru, kapurojss, 'Sühne'. Hahn oder Henne, welche am Vorabend des Versöhnungstages, nach altem Brauch, als symbolisches Sühnopfer dargebracht werden. Dieser Akt heisst: kapurojss schlugen".

[56] JE, II, 282, art. Atonement.

[57] Entdecktes Judenthum, II, 149-150.

[58] Op. cit., I, 628.

thereby to have the Christian bear their sins and become expiation for the Jew. There is yet another practice mentioned by M. Gaster.[59] He learned from the Samaritans that, whenever they kill an animal or a fowl during the ten penitential days (from New Year to the day of Atonement), they, in addition to the usual blessing, repeat the three following words: "לכפר, ולכפר, יכפר, 'to atone, and to atone, he shall atone'". "These are evidently taken", he adds, "as sin-offerings preparatory to the Day of Atonement".

In these customs and traditions the double notion in כָּפַר has found its way through all centuries up to the present time. And it is not correct to state, as Deissmann does, in reference to these customs, "dass ihm (i. e. kappôreth) der Begriff Sühnung geblieben ist".[60] As stated before, the idea of expiation appears, indeed, to predominate; but the other idea of propitiation is never excluded, on the contrary, it is always presupposed. Therefore sin, God, and men are the objects of כָּפַר and the derivatives.

We add two striking corollaries. The ancient Babylonian and the Arabic rituals of expiation offer close parallels to כָּפַר in the O. T.

Corollary 1. According to Zimmern[61] the Babylonian technical term for expiate is "kuppuru (Inf. Piel, mit dem entsprechenden Substantiv takpirtu) d. i. abwischen". This terminus technicus, he declares, is identical "mit hebr. כָּפַר, der technischen Bezeichnung für 'sühnen' in der Priestersprache, für das es auch die im Hebräischen selbst wohl nicht mehr durchgefühlte Grundbedeutung 'abwischen' sichert". He adds that the expiatory act is performed for persons as well as places and things. In this ritual the idea of expiation is not the only one contained; the hope of placating the gods and of becoming reconciled is the inseparable companion of expiation.

Corollary 2. Of interest also is Lagarde's suggestive study of the Arabic parallel, which dates from the time of the Koran. Lagarde shows "dass dem hebräischen כַּפֹּרֶת ein arabisches als technischer Ausdruck der Rechtskunde alltägliches kaffârat formell

[59] ERE, XI, 28, art. Sacrifice.

[60] Op. cit., 206.

[61] KAT³, 601-602. Cf. also Langdon, ExpT (1911), 324 and ERE, V, 640, art. Expiation and Atonement (Babylonian).

haarscharf entspricht".[62] He explains what the legal kaffârat of the Arabs is, and a few examples will suffice. "Wer ein nadr Gelübde oder ein Versprechen absichtlich unerfüllt gelassen hat, musz eine kaffârat [=כַּפֹּרֶת] erlegen". The kaffârat is likewise incumbent upon him "der seine Gattin beschimpft, der unabsichtlich einen Menschen . . . getötet (oder etwa durch seine Nachlässigkeit) den Tod eines Menschen veranlaszt, der nicht regelrecht gefastet, der im Ramadan gar nicht gefastet hat". The legal expiation for such offences was effected either by the setting free of a slave, by fasting, or by alms giving to the needy.[63] Even to the present time, as we learn from E. W. Lane,[63a] this practice is in vogue at Mohammedan burials in Egypt. Thus at the funeral of a person of rank or wealth, three skins of water and as many camel loads of bread are brought to the place of burial and are distributed to the poor who flock thither in great numbers. "This custome," according to Lane whom Lagarde[64] quotes, "is called 'el-kaffárah' (or the expiation); being supposed to expiate some of the minor sins (termed çagâïr) of the deceased, but not great sins (kebáïr)". Lagarde's conclusion is as follows: "Ich komme allerdings infolge meiner Anschauungen immer wieder zu dem Schlusse, dass כַּפֹּרֶת im Pentateuche die Gesetzeslade bedeute, sofern an sie die Versöhnung geknüpft war".[65] From the examples it can be seen that there is always an offence or sin committed, and expiation demanded. This act of expiating includes also the desire of placating and becoming reconciled. Hence Deissmann's[66] statement that "kappôreth bedeutet wie kaffârat Sühnung" must be corrected to include the idea of propitiation, since with the desire of expiation goes the wish to propitiate and become reconciled. The one necessarily presupposes the other.

The examples of ἱλάσκεσθαι—כִּפֶּר in Jewish literature and in the parallels of the Arabic and Babylonian rituals of purgation plainly show the presence of the essential elements of expiation and propitiation. But it is to be observed that, while these two

[62] Uebersicht über die Bildung der Nomina, 237. We transliterate the Arabic words. Cf. Margoliouth, ERE, V, 664, art. Expiation and Atonement (Muslim).

[63] Op. cit., 233.

[63a] Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, II, 268.

[64] Op. cit., 236.

[65] Op. cit., 237.

[66] Op. cit., 203.

fundamental ideas remain, the notion of locality in ἱλαστήριον—כַּפֹּרֶת has disappeared in later Jewish tradition. The reason for this disappearance is obvious. After the destruction of the temple the Jews had no place par excellence for carrying out these acts; hence, in Jewish tradition, ἱλαστήριον—כַּפֹּרֶת gradually lost its element of locality. At the time of the LXX, however, the factor of locality was considered so important, that it caused the LXX writers to coin the special word ἱλαστήριον which was unknown to the Greek world before this time. Certainly, profane Greek literature had the elements of expiation and propitiation in ἱλάσκεσθαι, but it lacked the substantive ἱλαστήριον with its designation of locality. On the other hand, patristic writers retain the elements of expiation and propitiation in ἱλάσκεσθαι, they know of and use the substantive ἱλαστήριον, and they clearly show that the birthplace of this substantive was the LXX.

The question now arises: which factor or which development caused the transfer of the LXX word ἱλαστήριον with its notion of locality into the Greek world at large? The answer is Philo, or better, that movement of thought which is represented most distinctly by Philo, namely, Jewish-Hellenic speculation.

III. *In Philo*

Between the profane and biblical Greek world of thought stands Philo (25 B. C.), well acquainted with both. He forms, as it were, the bridge upon which the two worlds meet and become, to a certain extent, amalgamated. What we have observed, therefore, in profane Greek and the LXX concerning the double notion applies also to the meaning of ἱλάσκεσθια as used by Philo. In *SS. Legum Allegoriarum III*, he speaks of the Atonement day which "expiates for the souls of us who have done evil—κακῶν ἡμῶν τὰς ψυχὰς ἱλάσκεται because, when we afflict and deprive ourselves of what pleases us, then God becomes propitious—ἵλεω τὸν Θεὸν ἔχειν"; [67] in *De Abrahamo* we hear of "propitiating with fear the royal and despotic power so as to ward off chastisement—τῷ φόβῳ τὴν ἡγεμονικὴν καὶ δεσποτικὴν ἱλασκόμενον ἐξουσίαν". [68] Again, in *De Monarchia II:* "God is propitiated by men and in turn He offers and grants favors to men—ἄνθρωποι μὲν ἱλάσκωντες Θεόν, Θεὸς δὲ τὰς χάριτας ἀνθρώποις . . . ὀρέγῃ καὶ χορηγῇ". [69]

[67] Opera, I, 121. [68] Opera, II, 20. [69] Opera, II, 230.

Philo occupies a prominent place in the ἱλαστήριον problem. He uses the word several times and, what is of specific import, he leaves no doubt that the O. T. is the source for this use. In *De Vita Mos. III,*[70] he states that the ark within the Holy of Holies had a covering and this covering was like to that which is called in the Bible ἱλαστήριον—ἡ δὲ κιβωτός . . , ἧς ἐπίθεμα, ὡσανεὶ πῶμα, τὸ λεγόμενον ἐν ἱεραῖς βίβλοις ἱλαστήριον. This ἱλαστήριον, he continues, physically (φυσικώτερον) typified the merciful power of God—τῆς ἵλεω τοῦ Θεοῦ δυνάμεως, and morally (ἠθικώτερον) the will to put aside vain and haughty opinions; further on in the same work we find again, τὸ δὲ ἐπίθεμα τὸ προσαγορευόμενον ἱλαστήριον. Mention may be made here of the indirect allusion to a locality where certain means obtained the mercy of God and where moral influence was exerted. In Philo's mind the LXX ἱλαστήριον was an altogether peculiar designation. In *De Profugis 19,*[71] we read that "the covering of the ark which Moses calls ἱλαστήριον—τὸ ἐπίθεμα τῆς κιβωτοῦ, καλεῖ δ' αὐτοῦ ἱλαστήριον—represents the merciful power of God". The cherubim are the images of the creative and kingly power, while "the Divine Word which is above these and which does not come into any visible appearance, in as much as it is not like to any of the things that come under the external senses, is itself an image of God". Proof for this he finds in Ex. xxv, 22 that God would speak to Moses from over the propitiatory. Here also we can see that Philo considered ἱλαστήριον as a special designation for the place where the Divine Word manifested itself. In *Quis Rerum Div. Haeres,*[72] Philo quotes Ex. xxv, 22 for evidence that as God spoke to Moses from the propitiatory in the midst of the two cherubim, so does He also stand above His creative and chastening power. *De Cherubim, 8,*[73] καὶ γὰρ ἀντιπρόσωπά φασιν εἶναι, νεύοντα πρὸς τὸ ἱλαστήριον ἑτέροις, is a clear allusion to Ex. xxv, 20 where we read that the cherubim stand face to face inclining toward the ἱλαστήριον. The word therefore expresses the locality where the presence of God was made known. Just as God spoke to Moses from over the propitiatory, so God stands between His powers, that of creating and governing, and by these powers His existence and presence are made manifest to the world. Summarizing we say that, according to Philo, the O. T. ἱλαστήριον was the place par excellence where God manifested His presence and His expiating and propitiating power. With certainty it may be

[70] Opera, II, 149-150.
[71] Opera, I, 561.
[72] Opera, I, 496.
[73] Opera, I, 143.

stated that the notions of expiation and propitiation in the word ἱλαστήριον were crystallized for the hellenic world by Jewish influence. The substantive ἱλαστήριον may be considered as a kind of syncretism which took place by Jewish-hellenic philosophical speculation. Any doubt concerning the correctness of this view will disappear when we study the fuller development of the word in the hellenic world under the influence of the LXX.

IV. *In Post-LXX Times*

We have already given due credit to Deissmann for throwing new light on the ἱλαστήριον problem. He has called attention to new applications of the term and it is necessary to study the material he presents in order to see whether or not his conclusions can stand in the light of the present investigation. After examining all the applications of the term known to him, Deissmann expresses the result in the following words: "An allen Stellen bedeutet ἱλαστήριον Versöhnungs- oder Sühnungsgegenstand, noch allgemeiner zutreffend ein Versöhnendes oder Sühnendes". "Die Specialbedeutung oder richtiger die Specialanwendung des Wortes ist also stets eine okkasionelle".[74]

If we recall a) that the two fundamental notions of expiation and propitiation were always found attached to the root of ἱλάσκεσθαι, b) that sacrifice or offering appeared as a constant companion idea of ἱλάσκεσθαι, c) that so far the substantive had an emphatic local signification, then, in view of these facts, it seems altogether impossible that ἱλαστήριον should not have a fixed meaning. And it is wholly improbable that these well-established notions should suddenly, or in the course of time, have given way to the mood and fancy of circumstances to signify sometimes this and sometimes that. Before submitting post-LXX material to a detailed examination two preliminary observations must be made.

1. *The meaning of words ending in* τήριον (or τηρ- -ιον).[74a] It is of no small importance for our problem that words ending in τήριον show the characteristic tendency to denote a locality. The subjoined list of such words is taken from the lexicon of Liddell-Scott,[75] and the meaning of each word is quoted *ad verbum*. We have arranged the list into three groups: the first containing those words whose meaning is given as 'place', the second containing

[74] Op. cit., 198.

[74a] Cf. Robertson, Grammar of Greek N. T., 154.

[75] Greek-English Lexicon.

those words whose meaning unmistakably points to 'locality', and the third whose meaning is given as 'means', 'instrument', etc.

Exactly 48 words ending in *τήριον* are mentioned in the dictionary with the express signification of 'a place'.

ἁγιαστήριον, τό, a holy place, sanctuary.
ἁγνευτήριον, τό, a place of purification.
ἀγωνιστήριον, τό, a place of assembly.
ἀθροιστήριον, τό, a muster-place.
ἀκροατήριον, τό, a place of audience.
ἀλειπτήριον, τό, a place for anointing.
ἁμιλλητήριον, τό, a place of contest.
ἀνακαμπτήριον, τό, a place to walk backwards and forwards in.
ἀναπαυστήριον, τό, a place of rest.
ἀρητήριον, τό, a place for prayer.
βαπτιστήριον, τό, a bathing-place.
γυμναστήριον, τό, the public place where athletic exercises were practised.
δεικτήριον, τό, a place for shewing.
ἐμβιωτήριον, τό, a place to live in.
ἐνηβητήριον, τό, a place of amusement.
ἐργαστήριον, τό, any place in which work is done.
εὐνατήριον, τό, a sleeping-place.
ἡβητήριον, τό, a place where young people meet.
ἡλιαστήριον, τό, a place for sunning oneself.
θρησκευτήριον, τό, a place of worship.
ἰπωτήριον, τό, a pressing-place.
καθαριστήριον, τό, a place for purifying.
κατασκοπευτήριον, τό, a look-out place.
κληρωτήριον, τό, at Athens, a place in the theatre, where the magistrates and dicasts sat; the place where elections by lot were held.
κοιμητήριον, τό, a sleeping-room, a burial-place.
κονιστήριον, τό, a place covered with dust, hence a rolling place.
κρυπτήριον, τό, a lurking-place or a dungeon.
κρυωτήριον, τό, a wine-cooler, a cool shady place.
λογιστήριον, τό, the place at Athens where the *λογισταί* met; a place for philosophical discussions.
μελετητήριον, τό, a place for practice.
μισθωτήριον, τό, a hiring place.
οἰκητήριον, τό, a dwelling-place.
οἰωνιστήριον, τό, a place for watching the flight of birds.

ὀργαστήριον, τό, for ὀργιαστήριον a place of orgies.
ὁρμητήριον, τό, a starting place.
πατητήριον, τό, a place where grapes are trodden.
πολεμητήριον, τό, the place from which a general carries on his operations.
πρατήριον, τό, a place for selling.
πωλητήριον, τό, a place where wares are sold.
σημαντήριον, τό, a place for coining money.
στολιστήριον, τό, a place where the priests attired themselves or the statues of the gods.
σχολαστήριον, τό, a place for passing leisure in.
τελεστήριον, τό, a place for initiation.
ὑποδεκτήριον, τό, a place of refuge or a reservoir.
ὑποδυτήριον, τό, v. sub ὑποδεκτήριον.
φροντιστήριον, τό, a place for meditation, a thinking-shop.
χρηματιστήριον, τό, a place for transacting business, a seat of judgment, a counting-house, a place for the oracle.
ψυκτήριον, τό, a wine-cooler, a cool shady place.

The second group comprises 87 words whose meaning plainly refers to a locality or place.

αἰσθητήριον, τό, an organ of sense.
ἀκεστήριον, τό, a tailor's shop.
ἀκουστήριον, τό, an audience chamber.
ἀκρωτήριον, τό, any topmost or prominent part, a cape, promontory.
ἀμυντήριον, τό, a defence, bulwark.
ἀναγνωστήριον, τό, a lectern, reading-desk.
ἀνακλιντήριον, τό, a recumbent chair.
ἀποδυτήριον, τό, an undressing room.
ἀριστητήριον, τό, a refectory.
ἀσκητήριον, τό, a hermitage or monastery.
αὐλητήριον, τό, a court-house.
αὐλιστήριον, τό, an abode, stall.
ἀφετήριον, τό (sc. πλοίων), the outlet of a seaport.
ἀφοδευτήριον, τό, a privy, a close-stool.
βασανιστήριον, τό, the question-chamber.
βουλευτήριον, τό, the council-chamber, senate-house.
γευστήριον, τό, a cup for tasting with.
δειπνητήριον, τό, a dining-room.

δεκατευτήριον, τό, the tenths-office, custom-house.
δεσμωτήριον, τό, a prison.
διαιτητήριον, τό, in pl. the dwelling rooms of a house.
δικαιωτήριον, τό, a house of correction.
δικαστήριον, τό, a court of justice.
δισωτήριον, τό, the temple of Ζεὺς Σωτήρ on the Acropolis at Athens.
ἐκκλησιαστήριον, τό, the hall of the ἐκκλησία, a church.
ἐκπιεστήριον (sc. ὄργανον), τό, a press.
ἐλαϊστήριον, τό, an olive-press.
εὐκτήριον, τό, an oratory.
εὐωχητήριον, τό, a banqueting-house.
ἑψητήριον, τό, a dish or pan for boiling.
ζητητήριον, τό, =βασανιστήριον.
ἠθητήριον, τό, a strainer, colander, esp. a wine-strainer.
ἡσυχαστήριον, τό, the retreat of an ἡσυχαστής.
θεωρητήριον, τό, a seat in a theatre.
θυμιατήριον, τό, a vessel for burning incense, a censer.
θυσιαστήριον, τό, an altar.
θυτήριον, τό, = θυσιαστήριον.
ἱδρωτήριον, τό, a sweating-bath.
καθιστήριον, τό, a seat.
καταλυτήριον, τό, an inn, lodging.
κλιντήριον, τό, a couch, sofa.
κολαστήριον, τό, a house of correction.
κοπανιστήριον, τό, a vessel for braying, a mortar.
κοσμητήριον, τό, a dressing-room.
κραστήριον, τό, a rack, manger.
κρατήριον, τό, a mixing vessel, esp. a large bowl, in which the wine was mixed with water.
κριτήριον, τό, a court of judgment, tribunal.
κυβευτήριον, τό, a gambling-house.
κωθωνιστήριον, τό, a banqueting house.
λῃστήριον, τό, a retreat or nest of robbers.
λουτήριον, τό, a washing or bathing-tub.
μοναστήριον, τό, a solitary dwelling, a monastery.
παιδευτήριον, τό, a school.
πειρατήριον, τό, a pirate's nest.
πεσσευτήριον, τό, an astronomical table of the Egyptians, divided into squares like a draught-board.

πιεστήριον, (sc. ὄργανον), τό, a press.
πιστήριον, τό, a drinking-trough for cattle.
πλαστήριον, τό, a work-shop.
ποτήριον, τό, a drinking-cup, wine-cup.
ποτιστήριον, τό, a drinking-trough for cattle.
προπολεμητήριον, τό, a bastion, outwork.
προφυλακτήριον, τό, an outpost, guard.
σακελιστήριον, τό, a strainer, colander.
σκοπευτήριον, τό, a beacon-hill.
σοφιστήριον, τό, a sophist's school.
στρεβλωτήριον, τό, a rack.
συνακτήριον, τό, an assembly.
σφαγιαστήριον, τό, a bowl for catching the blood of victims in sacrifices.
σφαιριστήριον, τό, a ball-court.
σωφρονιστήριον, τό, a house of correction.
ταβλιστήριον, τό, a gaming-house.
ταμιευτήριον, τό, a treasury, a magazine, storehouse.
τρυγητήριον, τό, a wine-press.
ὑγιαστήριον, τό, a hospital.
ὑλιστήριον, τό, a filter, strainer, colander.
ὑποκρατήριον, τό, the stand of a κρατήρ.
φοιτητήριον, τό, a school.
φονευτήριον, τό, a slaughter-house.
φυγαδευτήριον, τό, a city of refuge.
φυλακτήριον, τό, a guarded post, a fort or castle.
φυσητήριον, τό, a blow-hole, Lat. spiraculum.
φυτευτήριον, τό, a nursery or plantation.
φωτιστήριον, τό, a baptistery.
χαλκευτήριον, τό, a smith's shop, forge, smithy.
χρηστήριον, τό, an oracle, i. e., the seat of an oracle.
χωνευτήριον, τό, a smelting-furnace.
ψυχριστήριον, τό, a cooler.

Liddell-Scott mention 71 words ending in τήριον that express either means, instrument or other meanings.

ἁγνιστήριον, τό, a means of purifying.
ἀ-κυητήριον (sc. φάρμακον), τό, a drug to cause abortion.

ἀλεξητήριον, (sc. φάρμακον), τό, a remedy, medicine.
ἀλκτήριον, τό, a help, antidote.
ἀμητήριον, τό, a sickle.
ἀμπυκτήριον, τό, a horse's head band.
ἀναβατήριον (sc. ἱερόν), τό, a sacrifice for a fair voyage.
ἀνασπαστήριον, τό, a machine for raising a portcullis.
ἀποφθεγκτήριον, τό, an utterance.
γομφωτήριον, τό, a way of bolting.
δαμαστήριον, τό, an instrument for taming.
δηλητήριον (sc. φάρμακον), τό, poison.
διδακτήριον, τό, a proof.
δοκιμαστήριον, τό, a test, means of trial.
δραστήριον, τό, activity, energy.
ἐγερτήριον, τό, an excitement.
ἐλατήριον (sc. φάρμακον), τό, an opening medicine.
ἐμβατήριον (sc. μέλος), τό, the air to which the soldiers marched, a march.
ἐξεταστήριον, τό, a test, proof.
ἐπιβατήριον, τό, a festival to celebrate the advent of a god.
ἐπικριτήριον, τό, determination.
εὐφραντήριον, τό, a means of cheering.
ζευκτήριον, τό, a yoke.
θελκτήριον, τό, a charm, spell, enchantment.
θεριστήριον, τό, a reaping-hook.
θοινατήριον, τό, a meal, feast, banquet.
ἰατήριον, τό, a mode of cure, cure.
καθετήριον (sc. φάρμακον), τό, a plug of lint, pessary.
καλυπτήριον, τό, a covering.
καταπαυστήριον, τό, a means of putting to rest.
καυτήριον, τό, a branding iron.
κεντητήριον, τό, a pricker, awl.
κινητήριον, τό, a ladle.
κλαδευτήριον, τό, a pruning knife.
κλαστήριον, τό, a knife for dressing vines.
κλυστήριον, τό, a clyster-pipe, syringe.
κλωστήριον, τό, a clue.
κρεμαστήριον, τό, a drop in a necklace.
κυητήριον, τό, aiding delivery.
λαξευτήριον, τό, a stone-cutter's tool.
λικμητήριον, τό, a winnowing-fan or shovel.

μαλθακτήριον, τό, any emollient, a plaster, poultice.
μυστήριον, τό, a mystery or secret doctrine.
νικητήριον (sc. *ἆθλον*), *τό,* the prize of victory.
ὀνυχιστήριον, τό, a nail-knife or scissors.
ὁρκωμοτήριον, τό, an oath.
ὀρικτήριον, τό, a pickaxe or any sharp iron tool for digging.
ὀσφραντήριον (sc. *φάρμακον*), *τό,* strong scent used to revive persons fainting.
πεδορ-ραντήριον, τό, defilement.
περητήριον, τό, a borer.
περιρραντήριον, τό, an utensil for besprinkling.
πωμαστήριον, τό, a lid.
ῥαντιστήριον, τό, an instrument for sprinkling, a whisk.
ῥιπιστήριον, τό, a fan.
ῥωστήριον, τό, a strengthening medicine.
σιαλιστήριον, τό, a bridle-bit, which is apt to be covered with foam.
σκαλιστήριον, τό, an instrument for stirring or hoeing, a hoe.
σκεπτήριον, τό, a proof.
στηθιστήριον, τό, the poitrel of a war-horse.
στρωτήριον, τό, a rafter laid upon the bearing beam.
σφραγιστήριον, τό, a seal, stamp.
σχαστήριον, τό, a lancet.
σχετήριον, τό, a check, remedy.
ταγιστήριον, τό, a ration.
τεκμήριον, τό, a sure sign or token.
τριπτήριον, τό, a rubbing tool.
φρενωτήριον, τό, a means of instruction.
χαρακτήριον, τὸ, an instrument for marking or graving.
χαριστήριον, τό, a thank-offering.
χριστήριον, τό, an unguent, a bottle of ointments.
ψαλτήριον, τό, a stringed instrument.

Other substantives denoting locality, not found in Liddell-Scott, are *ἀπαντητήριον, τό,* deversorium,[76] a resting place, *δεσμευτήριον, τό,*[77] a prison, *κολλυβιστήριον, τό,*[78] a place for exchanging money, *κυκλευτήριον, τό,*[79] a circular place, *ἀποβατήριον, τό,*[80] a landing place. The sum total is 211 substantives ending in *τήριον*; of these 140

[76] Moulton-Milligan, Vocabulary of Greek Test., I, 53.
[77] Op. cit., II, 143.
[78] Op. cit., IV, 353.
[79] Op. cit., IV, 363.
[80] Jos. Flavius, Antiq. I, 3, 5.

designate a locality. This demonstrates that it is characteristic for words ending in τήριον to signify locality. Of course the possibility is obvious that the substantive ἱλαστήριον could follow the minority where the local notion is either not clear or not at all contained. But the probability exists also that it should follow the general tendency of words ending in τήριον.

2. Ἱλαστήριον *and the LXX.* We have observed that ἱλαστήριον does not occur in profane Greek before the time of the LXX and this shows that the word must be a product of the LXX. And in the LXX it signifies locality and nothing else. Does it seem possible that this word, devoid of its original meaning which it received from those who coined it, was given to the Greek world with a different meaning? Indeed, this would be a strange phenomenon. On the other hand, it would be entirely within the line of a natural development if the term, in the Greek world, retained that original meaning given it by its makers; and this the more so, since by this development it would follow the general characteristic of words ending in τήριον, many of which were used in profane Greek long before ἱλαστήριον arrived there.

A. *The Former Evidence in a New Light—Factors Misunderstood*

We now proceed to the examination of material presented by Deissmann. Here already it may be remarked that the examples of ἱλαστήριον in post-LXX literature clearly demonstrate that the local notion attached to the word by the LXX remains inseparably connected with it throughout its further history. Therefore we can say: Post hoc, ergo propter hoc. Deissmann offers applications of ἱλαστήριον in reference to

1. The Ark of Noe

Symmachus, in his translation of Gen. VI, 15, does not follow the LXX in naming the ark of Noe κιβωτός, but twice in the same verse he describes the ark as a ἱλαστήριον—"Eam [the ark] . . . arcae; (τὸ) ἱλαστήριον . . . (τοῦ) ἱλαστηρίου".[81] The meaning of ἱλαστήριον stands out here in its original realistic force. The ark was not a votive offering nor the means of reconciliation, but naturally

[81] Field, Origenis Hexaplorum, I, 23.

the place where salvation was offered. The local notion is the only possible one to be attached to the term. Deissmann cannot escape the forceful expression of the original local notion. He calls this application "sehr bedeutsam" and assigns as reason, "offenbar deshalb, weil sie der Gnadenort war: wer in der Arche sich barg, dem war Gott gnädig".[82] The element of propitiation is obvious. But what about the other element? Is the idea of expiation also connected with the ark? Certainly; and this is evident from the fact that only those were admitted who had pleased God by their faith. The latter, in contrast to the unfaithful who perished in the flood, are actually to be considered as being cleansed of sin, which was the reason why they found salvation in the ark. Such firm and immovable points should be a warning for the explanation of apparently doubtful examples. The pretext, that a word in different contexts should denote the most heterogeneous ideas, is an act of despair, and is opposed to general philological experience.

2. The Altar Ledge or Brim

No less important is the application of the term by the LXX to the altar ledge or brim (Ez. XLIII, 14, 17, 20). The verses read: "And from the bottom of the ground to the lowest brim (ἱλαστήριον—הָעֲזָרָה) two cubits and the breadth of one cubit; and from the lesser brim (ἱλαστήριον—הָעֲזָרָה) to the greater brim (ἱλαστήριον—הָעֲזָרָה) four cubits, and the breadth of one cubit" (v. 14). "And the brim (ἱλαστήριον—הָעֲזָרָה) was fourteen cubits long, and fourteen cubits broad in the four corners thereof" (v. 17). "And thou shalt take of his blood, and shalt put it upon the four horns thereof, and upon the four corners of the brim (ἱλαστήριον—הָעֲזָרָה), and upon the crown round about" (v. 20). This most realistic use of ἱλαστήριον, even Deissmann admits, "erklärt sich aus der sakralen Bestimmung der Umfriedigung: sie soll mit dem Blute des Sündopfers besprengt werden und ist deshalb entweder als eine Gnadenstätte oder als ein Sühnort aufgefasst".[83] Had he omitted the disjunctive conjunctions "entweder-oder" and written "und" instead, he would have given the term its exact proper meaning as the sacred place of expiation and propitiation. The

[82] Op. cit., 196.
[83] Op. cit., 196.

notion of locality is once more so conspicuous that no other explanation is possible. The question whether the expiatory and propitiatory elements are the concomitant ideas should not be raised again. Here also the combination of the two ideas is dictated by the context. The LXX writers selected the term ἱλαστήριον because it expressed comprehensively that special and sacred locality around the altar where, by the sprinkling of the blood of the sin-offering, expiation was made and propitiation obtained. Zahn, after referring to the O. T. ἱλαστήριον as "die vornehmste Stelle des Tempels, an welche am Versöhnungstag der Hohepriester das sühnkräftige Blut der Sündopfer sprengte", continues, in reference to the Ezechiel texts, "aus gleichartigem Grunde wird auch הַעֲזָרָה, die Einfriedigung des Brandopferaltars, durch ἱλαστήριον wiedergegeben".[84]

An example from Christian liturgy testifies with equal clearness to the fundamental local idea of ἱλαστήριον. In the *Typicum*, a liturgical work which is ascribed to St. Sabas (V century), we read, in chapter I, that the priest, after incensing the holy table and the entire altar, passes through the holy door and incenses directly before the ἱλαστήρια-κατενώπιον τῶν ἱλαστηρίων. And in chapter V the rubrics prescribe that the priest incense the holy table and also the entire ἱλαστήριον-τὸ ἱλαστήριον ἅπαν.[85] Deissmann frankly states that the word here describes "den Altarraum, den Chor der Kirche".[86] Most probably these applications refer to the entire sanctuary, and they show that the term was employed in what we claim to be its natural sense, i. e., locality. It is self-evident that this holy place could be designated as ἱλαστήριον, because it was at the altar of the sanctuary that the ἱλάσκεσθαι took place by means of sacrifice.

3. The Altar

If the altar ledge, the enclosure of the altar, and the sanctuary can be called so, then it need not surprise us to find the altar itself called ἱλαστήριον. In the lexicon of Hesychius[87] ἱλαστήριον is defined by καθάρσιον, θυσιαστήριον. Schleusner[88] quotes the above from Hesychius, and from the lexicon of Cyrillus: "ἱλαστήριον

[84] Op. cit., 184.
[85] DuCange, Glossarium Graecitatis, I, 513.
[86] Op. cit., 196.
[87] Hesychii Lexicon, II, 41.
[88] Novus Thesaurus, III, 109.

θυσιαστήριον, ἐν ᾧ προσφέρει (forte προσφέρεται legendum) περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν". Deissmann [89] cites both these instances but comments only on the first to the effect that Hesychius must have had a special application in mind when giving θυσιαστήριον as explanation of ἱλαστήριον. He states further that Hesychius explains the word by synonyms because "das Reinigende und das Sühnende liegen nahe zusammen". Certainly, these notions are inseparably connected. But why does not Deissmann add the meaning of θυσιαστήριον? If, as he argues, καθάρσιον means "that which purifies" and ἱλαστήριον "that which expiates", then θυσιαστήριον must mean "that which is sacrificed". But this meaning it cannot have; for everywhere we find that θυσιαστήριον designates the altar of sacrifice, or, to be more exact, the place of sacrifice. Consequently if ἱλαστήριον is explained by θυσιαστήριον then it must be a place where expiation and propitiation are accomplished. The example from Cyrillus says plainly and indisputably what we have tried to prove by circumstantial argumentation, namely, that ἱλαστήριον is the altar, the place of expiation and propitiation, upon which sacrifice for sins is offered.

4. A Church

A still wider application is given by John Cameniata (X cent.), who, in describing certain magnificent churches, says they are "ὥσπερ τινὰ κοινὰ πρὸς τὸ θεῖον ἱλαστήρια".[90] Deissmann [91] would render this passage "wie Versöhnungsgeschenke, die der Gottheit von der Gesamtheit geweiht sind"; and he adds that such an application would signify "ein Weihgeschenk, das zur Gnädigstimmung der Gottheit errichtet ist". There is no reason why the firmly-established local notion should have suddenly disappeared from ἱλαστήριον. Deissmann's explanation is not to the point. Every church may be a "Weihgeschenk"; but when the term ἱλαστήριον is applied to a particular church, then the "Weihgeschenk" becomes all that is comprised in this term, i. e., a place where, by sacrifice, expiation and propitiation are effected.

Two similar examples quoted by Deissmann appear, upon close examination, to refer not to the church but to the sanctuary proper. Theophanes Continuatus (X cent.) pens a description of a beautiful church of his time. He is at great pains to describe minutely the sanctuary of the church with its altars and holy tables. He

[89] Op. cit., 197.

[90] MPG, 109, 540; De Excidio Thessalonicae.

[91] Op. cit., 197. He quotes from the Corpus Scriptorum Byzantinorum.

then tells of the many singers who took part in the processions held therein and would have us know that such ceremonies were not unusual in a ἱλαστήριον of this kind—τῷ τοιούτῳ ἱλαστηρίῳ.[92] Again, he relates the generosity of Constantine toward the church. "Who can enumerate the beautiful carpets and vestments which Constantine gave εἰς τὸ κοινὸν ἱλαστήριον"? He adds that these same carpets still covered the floor of the Holy of Holies (the sanctuary) at his time.[93] In these quotations ἱλαστήριον clearly refers to the sanctuary of the church. But, be this as it may, the fundamental local notion of the term is obvious.

5. A Monastery

It is interesting to observe that, while the application of ἱλαστήριον widens, it never loses its local notion. Menander (X cent.) curiously enough calls a monastery a ἱλαστήριον. Speaking about "τὸν μοναστήριον οἶκον τὸν λεγόμενον Σέβανον", he relates how the Persians, after breaking their truce made with the Romans, captured this section of the country and, coming into possession of the monastery Sebanon, they fortified it with strong walls—τείχει τε κατησφαλισμένων τὸ ἱλαστήριον.[94] Such an application, Deissmann holds, can be explained in two ways: "Das Kloster ist entweder . . . als gnädigstimmendes Weihgeschenk an Gott aufgefasst, oder . . . als der Gnadenort, wo der Mensch die Sühnung seiner Sünden findet".[95] His first hypothesis is improbable for, as we have observed, "Weihgeschenk" does not express the literal meaning of ἱλαστήριον. A monastery may be a votive offering according to the will and wish of the builder or donor, but when designated as a ἱλαστήριον it can only be a place where expiation and propitiation are performed. Hence, Deissmann's second hypothesis is more near the truth, since monasteries are places where expiation for sins is made and the grace of God obtained; and places where the monks by their prayers and works of mortification make expiation for the sins of the world and propitiate an offended God.

In the opinion of Deissmann, Joseph Genesius (X cent.) also applies the term to a monastery. But we learn from Theophanes Continuatus[96] that the application is rather to the sanctuary of a

[92] MPG, 109, 341, Basilius Macedo, 83.
[93] MPG, 109, 469, Constantinus Porphyrogenitus, 28.
[94] MPG, 113, 857, De Legationibus Romanorum.
[95] Op. cit., 197.
[96] MPG, 109, 220.

church. Joseph relates that Bardas (regent in place of his brother Michael III) set out on an expedition. He had forebodings of his approaching death and went to a nearby place called Hodegus, apparently to pray. "While Bardas was standing at the entrance of the ἱλαστήριον—ὡς δὲ παρεστήκει τοῖς τοῦ ἱλαστηρίου προθύροις, his mantle was suddenly torn from his shoulders. He at once saw in this another omen of doom and prayed to the Mother of God for deliverance from the evils impending".[97] Deissmann understands this passage to refer to a monastery; but Theophanes, who relates the same expedition, says "Bardas went to the church of the Mother of God which is called Hodegus—πρὸς τὸν τῆς . . . θεοτόκου ναόν, ὃς οὕτω δὴ Ὁδηγοὶ κατονομάζεται". The context in the former passage also points to this. Therefore the term is here again employed to designate the special holy place within the church, i. e., the sanctuary, the Holy of Holies of the N. T. That Joseph Genesius most probably meant this, and not a monastery, is intimated by a similar narrative which Deissmann overlooks. In the same work,[98] we hear that the death of Leo V, the Armenian, was determined upon by his enemies. Disguised as priests, they hid in the church and lay in wait for Leo. At the beginning of the hymn of matins Leo, as was his custom, entered the church. His enemies, by mistake, attacked one of the priests, thus giving the alarm to Leo who entered the ἱλαστήριον—οὐκοῦν ὁ βασιλεὺς εἰσῄει τῷ ἱλαστηρίῳ. His assassins followed and there killed him. There can be no doubt that Joseph here applies the term to the sanctuary; and there is not the least reason to read anything else into the former passage.

6. Statues and Monuments

The use of the term ἱλαστήριον in inscriptions on statues and monuments constitutes the only real difficulty in the problem's history, because such applications can be explained in more than one way. But, in view of the constant retention of the local meaning which all previous examples demanded, we may rightly expect that the use of the word in inscriptions on statues and monuments also demands for these applications the established, traditional, and historic sense. We have no right to presuppose a sudden break in the accepted meaning of the term.

On a statue or on the base of a statue of the imperial period

[97] MPG, 109, 1124, Regum Lib. IV.
[98] MPG, 109, 1020, Regum Lib. I.

the following inscription is found: "The people of Cos, for the welfare of the Emperor Caesar Augustus, the son of god, *θεοῖς ἱλαστήριον—ὁ δᾶμος ὑπὲρ τὰς Αυτοκράτορος, Καίσαρος θεοῦ ὑιοῦ, Σεβαστοῦ σωτηρίας θεοῖς ἱλαστήριον*".[99] Another imperial inscription, occurring upon the fragment of a pillar, reads thus: "The people of Hales, to the August and Warlike Zeus, under the presidency of Gaius Norbanus, son of Moschion, friend of Caesar, *ἱλαστήριον—[ὁ δᾶμος ὁ Ἀλεντίων . . . Σε]βασ[τ]ῷ Διὶ Σ[τ]ρατίῳ ἱλαστήριον, δαμαρχεῦντος Γαΐου Νωρβανοῦ Μοσχίωνο[ς φι]λοκαίσαρος*".[100] A third application is found in Dio Chrysostom (II cent. A. D.): "The Achains shall set up a most beautiful and large votive offering to Athene, and upon it shall inscribe: *ἱλαστήριον Ἀχαιοὶ τῇ Ἰλιάδι—καταλείψειν γὰρ αὐτοὺς ἀνάθημα κάλλιστον καὶ μέγιστον τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ καὶ ἐπιγράψειν· ἱλαστήριον Ἀχαιοὶ τῇ Ἰλιάδι*".[101]

After quoting these examples Deissmann remarks: "In allen diesen Fällen ist *ἱλαστήριον* der technische Ausdruck für ein die Gottheit gnädig stimmendes Weihgeschenk; man könnte übersetzen Besänftigungsgeschenk, Versöhnungsgeschenk".[102] Deissmann's meaning appears to be entirely too general and "Weihgeschenk" is hardly correct. Elsewhere[102a] after quoting these examples, Deissmann remarks that, "early in the imperial period, it was a not uncommon custom to dedicate propitiatory gifts to the Gods, which were called *ἱλαστήρια*". Furthermore, he says, it is very probable that St. Paul knew the word in this sense, for "if he had not already become familiar with it by living in Cilicia, he had certainly read it here and there in his wanderings through the empire, when he stood before the monuments of paganism and pensively contemplated what the piety of a dying civilisation had to offer to its known or unknown Gods". Similarly, the Christians in Rome "would know what a *ἱλαστήριον* was in their time".

We readily agree that St. Paul and the Roman Christians could have had a knowledge, and probably did, of such inscriptions. But what meaning would the term *ἱλαστήριον* convey to them? Deissmann has no proof that it designated a propitiatory gift. It is true, if we totally ignore the history of the term, then the monument could be called a "Weihgeschenk", erected for the

[99] Paton-Hicks, Inscriptions of Cos, No. 81, 126.
[100] Paton-Hicks, Op. cit., No. 347, 225-226.
[101] Oratio XI, Edition of Reiske, 355.
[102] Op. cit., 195.
[102a] BS, 131-132.

welfare of the emperor because of past favors shown the people. Again, if we abstract from the historical development of the term, the monument could, per se, be styled "Versöhnungsgeschenk", because the people hoped by its erection to procure the present or future favors of the emperor. But, if considered in the light of the term's history, the situation is entirely different. That the substantive should now have abandoned its historical basic notion and taken on a new meaning must be proved. On the other hand, we have shown that the fundamental and historical meaning of ἱλαστήριον is that of locality and, what is of the greatest importance, its frequent application in the O. T. with this essential local idea, was very well known to St. Paul and could also have been known to his readers. Both would naturally have understood the word in that sense familiar to them and this must have been the original meaning given to the term by those who coined it, the LXX writers.

Our argument receives additional convincing evidence by the fact that history also records the erection of statues to gods as distinct symbols of expiation. In the *Description of Greece*, II, XX, 1, PAUSANIAS (180 A. D.) mentions the erection of a statue to a god as a symbol of expiation for an offence of blood-shedding. The statue is described as one of white marble, representing Zeus Meilichius in a sitting posture (ἄγαλμά ἐστι καθήμενον Διὸς Μειλιχίου, λίθου λευκοῦ). Upon investigation, Pausanias relates, he discovered that the statue was erected for the following reason. The Lacedaemonians and the Argives were constantly at war with one another; the trouble being caused by the Lacedaemonians, who were always attempting to annex a piece of Argive territory. Determined to defend themselves and their country, the Argives selected a thousand picked men and placed them under the command of Bryas. His behaviour toward the people was offensive, and on one occasion he seized a maiden who was being taken to the bridegroom and raped her. That night when Bryas was asleep the girl put out his eyes and then fled to the people who shielded her. The Thousand demanded that the maiden be delivered to them for punishment; when the people refused both sides took up arms. In the civil war that followed the citizens defeated the picked soldiers and in their anger left none of the soldiers alive. Later on, Pausanias concludes, the people, among other things, brought purifying sacrifices for the guilt of kindred blood and erected a state to Zeus Meilichius — ὕστερον δὲ ἄλλα τε ἐπηγάγοντο καθάρσια ὡς ἐπὶ αἵματι ἐμφυλίῳ καὶ ἄγαλμα ἀνέθηκαν Μειλιχίου Διὸς. There can be no doubt

that this statue, erected by the Argives after the blood-shed, should serve as a distinct expiation for that sin; καθάρσια expresses this very clearly. It is a natural sequence that the statue was erected also with the intention of propitiating the possible anger of the god. Hence we see that a statue was erected, where, by the means of sacrifices, the people hoped to expiate their sin and to regain the good will of the god. This historical fact proves that statues were set up by the people for the purpose of manifesting their desire to make expiation for some offence and thus to propitiate the god's anger by the means of sacrifices. Now, therefore, when we find statues or monuments, erected to the gods or to emperors, who at that time were revered as gods, and inscribed with the additional and specific term ἱλαστήριον, the conclusion must be that this was done with the intention of designating these particular statues as places of expiation and propitiation—be it that the sacrifices were offered at the very place where the statue was erected, or that this statue is a symbol of the real place of sacrifice. In the example from Dio Chrysostom it is plainly seen that, first of all, an ἀνάθημα is to be erected. Then this votive offering is to receive the further inscription of ἱλαστήριον. This shows that "Weihgeschenk" or "propitiatory gift" is not the correct meaning.

Another example, which presents, perhaps, even clearer evidence than the inscriptions, is offered by Josephus (b. 37 A. D.). He relates that Herod sought treasures in the tomb of David and Solomon. Two of his soldiers entered the tomb and advanced as far as the place where their bodies were buried. Suddenly a flame burst forth from the tomb upon the guards and they fled. Then Herod "because of fear built a ἱλαστήριον, a monument of white stone at the entrance to the sepulchre, and that at a great expense—περίφοβος δ' αὐτὸς ἐξῆει καὶ τοῦ δέους ἱλαστήριον μνῆμα λευκῆς πέτρας ἐπὶ τῷ στομίῳ κατεσκευάσατο πολυτελὲς τῇ δαπάνῃ".[103] Deissmann[104] takes ἱλαστήριον to mean "Beschwichtigungsmittel seiner Angst" or "Sühnemittel für seinen ihm Angst einflössenden Frevel"; and adds, one may surmise that Herod's monument served "als Weihgeschenk an Gott . . ." A monument in itself might be called a "Weihgeschenk"; but when the monument is erected to make atonement for a crime, as in the present case, and when it is further called ἱλαστήριον, then the meaning "Weihgeschenk" is altogether out of place. Besides, the history of the word shows that

[103] Antiq. XVI, 7, 1.

[104] Op. cit., 196.

ἱλαστήριον has never denoted a simple votive offering. Neither can the term be rendered 'means of expiation', since for this expression only one word was available, i. e., ἱλασμός. But this monument must indicate the place where Herod sought to expiate his guilt of attempted robbery and to propitiate the anger of God. Moreover, if Josephus, the Jew, employs the word ἱλαστήριον, we must suppose that it retains the sense given it by its originators, the LXX writers, with which meaning Josephus was very familiar.

Having examined the material offered by Deissmann, it can readily be seen why our exegesis leads to quite opposite conclusions. He overlooks the basic notion entirely and reads into all these passages "Versöhnungs- oder Sühnungsgegenstand, noch allgemeiner zutreffend ein Versöhnendes oder Sühnendes". Nor can we for one moment admit his assertion that the selection of either "Versöhnendes" or "Sühnendes" "hat überall der Zusammenhang zu entscheiden".[105] The context is not the deciding factor in determining which element is to be chosen, because the context is not always clear. Both the usage of profane Greek and our LXX study go to show that both elements are fundamentally contained in the root-verb and what is true of the root cannot be lost on its way to the various derivatives. Any departure from this accepted sense must be proved on better evidence than that furnished by Deissmann. It was disastrous for his results that he neglected the historical development of the complicated idea of the term and overlooked the fundamental notion of locality furnished by the LXX.

B. *New Corroborative Evidence*

We now present some fresh material, all of it plainly indicating that the word must express a local notion. We have discovered applications of the term ἱλαστήριον in reference to

1. The Blessed Virgin

The author of the *Sermo de Simeone et Anna,* which has been erroneously ascribed to METHODIUS,[106] describes Mary as τὸ ἱλαστήριον from which God in human form became known to men—τὸ ἱλαστήριον ἐξ οὗ Θεὸς ἐγνώσθη ἀνθρώποις ἀνθρωπομόρφως.[107] Such an identification of Mary with the O. T. propitiatory is indeed excep-

[105] Op. cit., 198.
[106] Cf. Bardenhewer, Patrology, 178.
[107] MPG, 18, 372.

tional and extraordinary. The association of ideas, however, is quite natural. Just as God's presence was disclosed to the Israelites from over the propitiatory in the Holy of Holies, so now, through Mary, God becomes manifest to all the world. Mary it is who bears Christ, God's sacrifice for our sins, and therefore she may be styled *τὸ ἱλαστήριον*, where God manifests Himself to the world and vouchsafes universal expiation and propitiation.

In the oration, *In Dormitionem S. Mariae, III,* ANDREW of Crete thus addresses Mary: "Hitherto while living upon earth you could be claimed as part of the earth; but now, that you have been taken from all that is human, the entire world embraces thee as a common *ἱλαστήριον—ὁ σύμπας περιέχει σε κόσμος κοινὸν ἱλαστήριον*".[108] Our explanation of the preceding passage also applies here. Mary is not a votive offering nor a propitiatory gift. It is evident that only the local notion of *ἱλαστήριον* can be the foundation for Andrew's speculation. Mary's womb is the place where God manifested Himself to the world for salvation.

The same arguments hold good for the applications of the term by GERMANUS. In homily I, *In Praesentationem SS. Deiparae,* he calls Mary the new *ἱλαστήριον* which is most God-like, not made by hand and gifted with cleansing power — *ἱλαστήριον καινόν τε καὶ θεοειδέστατον καθαρτικόν τε καὶ ἀχειρότευκτον χρηματίσασα.*[109] In the homily, *In Annuntiationem SS. Deiparae,* Germanus composes a dialogue between Mary and the angel Gabriel. The angel says to her: "You shall become the common *ἱλαστήριον* of all Christians—*χριστιανῶν ἁπάντων γενήσῃ κοινὸν ἱλαστήριον*"; and later Gabriel again addresses Mary as the *ἱλαστήριον* of the entire world—*τοῦ κόσμου παντὸς ἱλαστήριον.*[110] These quotations clearly indicate also an intended contrast between the O. T. type and its N. T. antitype as applied to Mary. Attention is called to the use of the future (*γενήσῃ*) which shows that Mary was not a *ἱλαστήριον* from all times, but was to become such only after she became the Mother of Christ.

2. The Altar

To the examples of Deissmann, where *ἱλαστήριον* is defined by the synonym *θυσιαστήριον*, can be added several more direct testimonies. Already THEODORE of Mopsuestia, when explaining Amos

[108] MPG, 97, 1100.

[109] MPG, 98, 293.

[110] MPG, 98, 329. See also 308 where Germanus calls Mary *παγκόσμιον ἱλαστήριον.*

IX, 1, writes that the Lord instructed the prophet to strike the ἱλαστήριον—πλῆξαι τὸ ἱλαστήριον, thus calling ἱλαστήριον an altar—ἵνα εἴπῃ, τὸ θυσιαστήριον. This testimony receives additional importance when Theodore expresses in clear terms his reasons for the use of the word; for, he adds, "the altar is a ἱλαστήριον because upon it sacrifices are offered as means of expiation and propitiation — ἱλαστήριον γὰρ αὐτὸ καλεῖ ὡς ἐπὶ ἱλασμοῖς τῶν θυσίων προσαγομένων".[111] We must be grateful to Theodore for such an express definition of the disputed word. This alone provides certain evidence for the correct solution of our problem.

CYRIL of Alexandria, commenting on Amos IX, 1, changes the LXX reading "πάταξον τὸ ἱλαστήριον" into "strike upon the altar—πάταξον ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον".[112] Which permits the reasonable deduction that Cyril considered θυσιαστήριον as synonym of ἱλαστήριον, and then the latter word must share the local notion of the former.

In *Rerum Ecclesiast. Contemplatio,* a liturgical work which is generally attributed to Germanus but which is "of very doubtful authenticity",[113] we meet passages which are self-explanatory. In this treatise on the church, its furnishings, and ceremonies, the author writes that in the church is found τὸ ἱλαστήριον and the Holy of Holies—ἐν ᾗ τὸ ἱλαστήριον, καὶ τὰ Ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων.[114] We learn what he designates as ἱλαστήριον when he says: "θυσιαστήριόν ἐστιν ἱλαστήριον, ἐν ᾧ προσεφέρετο περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας".[115] In the explanation of the liturgy of the Mass, we are told that, "as the invisible God spoke to Moses and Moses to God, so the priest, standing between the two cherubim before the ἱλαστήριον—ὁ ἱερεύς, μέσον τῶν δύο χερουβὶμ ἑστὼς ἐν τῷ ἱλαστηρίῳ, converses silently with God".[116] We see that the sanctuary of our churches is contrasted with the Holy of Holies of the O. T. and our altar is compared with the O. T. ἱλαστήριον. Probably this is the reference Suidas has in mind when he defines ἱλαστήριον as "θυσιαστήριον, propitiatorium: altare, supra quod per sacrificia fiebat propitiatio divinique Numinis placatio".[117] It may be added that in the lexicons of Suidas[118] ἱλαστήριον is always defined by the synonym θυσιαστήριον;

[111] MPG, 66, 297.
[112] MPG, 71, 561.
[113] Bardenhewer, Patrology, 582.
[114] MPG, 98, 385.
[115] MPG, 98, 389.
[116] MPG, 98, 429.
[117] Quoted from Suicerus, Thesaurus Eccles., 1448.
[118] Suidae Lexicon, II, 114; Suidas-Bekkerus, Lexicon, 528.

which shows that ἱλαστήριον obviously possesses in common with θυσιαστήριον the local idea.

Christodulos, who in the XI century was patriarch of the Copts,[119] lays down in his liturgical canons that "the holy table should be, as a rule, within the select part of the church, and therefore it is placed in the middle of the sanctuary, the very Holy of Holies, where the altar or the ἱλαστήριον is—τὸ θυσιαστήριον ἢ καὶ ἱλαστήριον".[120] This reference is perfectly obvious.

It is interesting to note that the Coptic language employs for the term θυσιαστήριον, the expressive equivalent ⲙⲁⲡⲉⲣϣⲟⲩϣⲓ, which literally means "the place of doing (the) sacrificing". Butler[121] remarks that "etymologically the Coptic term for altar seems to correspond very closely with the Greek". This Coptic term, he adds, conveys the notion of a place of making sacrifice "so that the idea is clearly that of a sacrificial structure like the θυσιαστήριον of the Greek Church". Further comment is unnecessary.

3. The Confession of Altars

According to Anastasius Bibliothecarius (IX cent.) "propitiatorium" signifies a distinct part of the altar, to be more exact, the confessio in which the bodies of martyrs and confessors were placed. Over the confession the altar was erected. In his life of Pope Paschal we meet with several such applications. Thus he writes that Paschal erected a "propitiatorium sacri altaris beati Petri apostolorum principis, ubi sacratissimum corpus ejus requiescit".[122] Elsewhere he identifies propitiatorium with confessio: "Propitiatorium vero sacri altaris, seu confessionem";[123] and again: "Propitiatorium denique sacri altaris, seu confessionem".[124] In the same way: "Propitiatorium etiam altaris ex laminis argenteis exornatum circumduxit, atque sacram confessionem ejus interius exteriusque cum rugulis suis nobilissime circumstruxit".[125] Anastasius does not mean the ciborium for we also read: "Fecit autem in eadem ecclesia ciborium ex argento,

[119] Cf. Fortescue, Lesser East. Churches, 235, London, 1913.

[120] Daniel, Codex Lit. Eccl. Orient., 208.

[121] Coptic Churches, II, The Altar, 1. Cf. Renaudot, Liturgiarum Collectio, I, 164, Londini, 1847.

[122] MPL, 128, 1271-1272.

[123] MPL, 128, 1269-1270.

[124] MPL, 128, 1265-1266.

[125] MPL, 128, 1261-1262.

. . . imo et propitiatorium sacri altaris ex argenteis laminis mirifice exornavit".[126] In these quotations "propitiatorium" undoubtedly refers to the sepulchre of the martyrs over which the altar was built.[127] Its meaning in such a usage is evident, for the martyrs' crypt was a special place of veneration. There the faithful gathered and through the intercession of the martyr or confessor sought expiation for sins and propitiation and grace from God by sacrifice in honor of the martyr.

Hugo Flaviniacensis (ca. 1100) also calls the crypt of a saint a "propitiatorium". He describes the burial of St. Sanctinus. "Sacratissimum corpus ejus ad propiciandum Deum miseris mortalibus super altare in celesti propiciatorio ab episcopis honorifice repositum est".[128] In *Chronicon II,* he again makes use of the word to designate the confession of the martyrs. "Propiciatorium sane sanctorum", he writes, "exornant corpora, quorum meritis floret ecclesia".[129] These applications of "propitiatorium" to the confession of martyrs are distinct evidences for the meaning of locality.

4. A Tomb or Sepulchre

In the life of St. Thecla, supposed to have been written by Basil of Seleucia,[130] we read that the "place of burial is like the office of a healing surgeon, and it has become the common *ἱλαστήριον* of the whole world—*ὡς εἶναι πάνδημον ἰατρεῖον τὸν τόπον, καὶ κοινὸν κεθετάναι τῆς γῆς ἁπάσης ἱλαστήριον*". Basil adds that strangers and residents of the city flocked to the tomb, which was never deserted by devout clients of the saint. Some came out of reverence or to make promises or to fulfil them; others, to obtain relief in their pains or aid in their spiritual battles.[131] As used here, *ἱλαστήριον* describes a special place (*τόπος*) where a higher

[126] Ibid.

[127] Cf. Heuser, REA, I, 325-327 art. Confessio.

[128] MPL, 154, 38. The relics of martyrs were not placed immediately upon the altar, "sondern auf einem Gerüste hinter der Mensa," as Probst says in Kirchenlexikon, I, 590, art. Altar. This practice was approved by Pope Leo IV (855) who says: "Super altare nihil ponatur, nisi capsae cum reliquiis sanctorum" (MPL, 115, 677).

[129] MPL, 154, 208.

[130] Tixeront, Handbook of Patrology, 210, says this "life of St. Thecla in prose is probably not the work of Basil"; Bardenhewer, Patrology, 532, merely states that Basil wrote "a long life of the so-called protomartyr Thecla".

[131] MPG, 85, 560.

power is present as salvation from physical or moral evils; furthermore, a place where expiation and propitiation are found: the former, in obtaining through the saint's intercession relief from afflictions, and the latter, in the reception of grace from God. Zahn knows of this passage but draws no conclusion. In reference to such applications he says: "Als Stätten, wo man Sühne seiner Sünden und Gnade bei Gott findet, werden in der jüngeren Literatur Kirchen, Klöster, besonders auch die Altäre nicht selten ἱλαστήρια genannt".[132] We can only add to this frank statement that later literature presents the reflection of an old, well established terminology.

The completed study of old and new material has made it clear that ἱλαστήριον, in its literal meaning, has reference to a locality. We know that the term has a definite and determinate complex meaning and this is: *a sacred place* where *expiation and propitiation* are accomplished generally by the *means of sacrifice* or *offering.*

Corollary. The Adjective ἱλαστήριος. Along with the substantive there occur also sporadically adjectival uses of the term. In a recently discovered papyrus of the second century the following passage appears: τοῖς θεοῖς εἱλαστη[ρίο]υς θυσίας ἀξιω[θέ]ντες ἐπιτελεῖσθαι.[133] On this Deissmann remarks: "Ob hier ἱλαστήριος θυσία die Bedeutung Versöhnungsopfer hat, oder Sühnopfer, ist nicht zu entscheiden".[134] But it is clear that ἱλαστηρίους θυσίας must signify expiatory and propitiatory sacrifices offered to the gods. In IV Machabees XVII, 22 we read that the seven martyrs became, as it were, a substitution for the sins of the nation and that through their blood and their ἱλαστηρίου death divine Providence saved Israel—διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τῶν εὐσεβῶν ἐκείνων καὶ τοῦ ἱλαστηρίου θανάτου αὐτῶν.[135] Deissmann[136] argues for the meaning "sühnend" but the propitiatory element is present also. The sacrificial death of the martyrs served as expiation for the sins of the people and at the same time as propitiation of divine Providence. NICEPHORUS of Antioch, in his life of St. Simeon Stylites, records that God visited the people with a fatal pestilence. Simeon, recognizing in this a punishment from God because of the sins of the people, in

[132] Op. cit., 184.
[133] Grenfell-Hunt, Fayum Towns and their Papyri, 313, No. 337.
[134] Op. cit., 193.
[135] Swete, Old Testament in Greek, III, 759-760, Cambridge, 1912.
[136] Op. cit., 194.

prayer lifted up his suppliant, or rather, his propitiatory hands to God until the pestilence ceased—χεῖρας ἱκετηρίους, εἰ βούλει δὲ ἱλαστηρίους, ἐκτείνας Θεῷ.[137] "Versöhnend" is Deissmann's[133] selection. But we see that the people had offended God. Simeon, as their intercessor, by his prayers expiated for the people and rendered God propitious. In the same work Nicephorus relates of a destructive earthquake that took place at Constantinople. The mother of St. Simeon, perceiving in the earthquake divine punishment, and anxious for the salvation of the people, appealed to her son. Simeon, we are told, retired to his cell and did not cease in his supplications until divine mercy was shown and until he, the suppliant, found those (things) procuring ἱλαστήρια with God by word of mouth—ἃ διὰ στόματος ἔχοντα εὗρεν ἱλαστήρια πρὸς Θεὸν ἡ ἱκεσία.[139] The word ἱλαστήρια appears to be used as an adjective qualifying ἃ; and this may refer to the prayers or words of Simeon which were both expiatory and propitiatory.

Such examples again prove that the term when used as an adjective faithfully retains the elements of expiation and propitiation. Of course it is only natural that the local notion should disappear when the term is employed as an adjective.

---

[137] MPG, 86², 3056.

[138] Op. cit., 194. Deissmann quotes from the Acta SS. Maii, V, 335.

[139] MPG, 86,² 3089; Acta SS. Maii, V, 348.

CHAPTER IV

Application of the Results to Rom. III, 25

It now remains to be seen whether the results of the completed investigation are applicable to Rom. III, 25. Before making this application, however, let us recapitulate our results and those of Deissmann with his exegesis on the Pauline term, and let us briefly examine other N. T. material.

In the historical part it was shown that the variety of renderings found in the different versions indicates the presence of more than one element in the disputed term. This hypothesis was given greater probability by the manifold interpretations of modern exegetes who, in their search for its satisfactory application to Christ, employed now one, now another element. Among all opinions the one which applied ἱλαστήριον to Christ as the antitype of the O. T. propitiatory was found the most prominent. Some few moderns expressed the view that the O. T. ἱλαστήριον was the place of expiation or propitiation or manifestation of God. Quotations from patristic writers emphatically showed that the O. T. type was considered a special locality. The patristic interpretation of Rom. III, 25, especially that of the Greek Fathers, builds up a convincing argument for the conclusion that St. Paul applied the term to Christ with the avowed purpose of proving that He in His sacrifice literally fulfilled all that was typified by the O. T. propitiatory.

In the exegetical part it was conclusively demonstrated, both from profane and biblical Greek literature, that ἱλάσκεσθαι with its cognates essentially contains the elements of expiation, propitiation, and reconciliation; and that quite generally these acts were procured by means of sacrifice or oblation. It was further seen that the substantive ἱλαστήριον, with its fundamental notion of locality, originated beyond all doubt in the LXX. The application of the noun to various localities and to the Blessed Virgin was confirmative evidence for our conclusion.

Deissmann arrives at conclusions quite the reverse. According to him the term has no definitely fixed meaning and, therefore, in every application the context must decide which element is present. In applying his results to Rom. III, 25, he begins by saying there is "weder eine feste allgemeingriechische Verwendung des Wortes,

noch eine feste 'biblische'". From this he argues that there is only one general meaning which can be considered, and this is: "ἱλαστήριον bedeutet ein Versöhnendes oder ein Sühnendes".[1] These statements must be altered in the light of the present investigation which concludes with unmistakable evidence that the word has a definitely fixed meaning, attached to it already by its authors, the LXX writers, and traceable throughout its history; which meaning is that of *a sacred place where expiation and propitiation are accomplished by sacrifice.*

Deissmann's next statement is, that the exegetical problem in Rom. III, 25 consists in ascertaining what the object of the term is, or, to put it in his own words: "Was ist als Objekt des in ἱλαστήριον steckenden ἱλάσκεσθαι von Paulus gedacht; Gott? oder die Menschen? oder die Sünde?". He finds that very probably sin and sin alone is its object and so, as applied to Christ, the term designates Him "als der Sühner oder das Sühnende".[2] But the upshot of our study in its various phases, especially profane Greek and the LXX, leaves no room for further doubt that ἱλάσκεσθαι and its derivatives have as object not sin alone but also the Divinity and men. Hence it means to expiate sin, to propitiate God, and thus to reconcile Him with man.

Finally Deissmann puts the question: "Bezieht sich das Bekenntnis des Apostels auf den irdischen oder auf den erhöhten Christus?". He believes St. Paul has in mind the physical blood of Christ—"αἷμα ist dann das physische, einmal vergossene Blut Christi". However, he does not exclude the possibility, or even the probability, of the second part of the proposition, according to which ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι means "in der Blutsgemeinschaft mit dem erhöhten, pneumatisch-lebendigen Herrn".[3] Such a formulation is undoubtedly wrong; for in Rom. III, 25, St. Paul does not concern himself with the earthly or the exalted Christ. He knows only the one Christ who is both God and man, and, as we shall see, the entire verse with its surrounding context demands the interpretation of reality. The reference, therefore, is to the real blood shed by Christ as expiation and propitiation for mankind.

1. Ἱλάσκεσθαι and its Derivatives in the N. T.

In N. T. writings ἱλάσκεσθαι and its derivatives seldom occurs. The few examples that are found, however, clearly show that here

[1] Op. cit., 209.
[2] Op. cit., 211.
[3] Op. cit., 211.

also it has the same sense as in profane and O. T. literature. St. Luke employs it in the parable of the pharisee and the publican (XVIII, 13). The latter, standing afar off in the temple, is conscious of the guilt of sin. He seeks expiation and, striking his breast, prays solely for God's mercy, pardon, and grace: *ὁ Θεός, ἱλάσθητί μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ.* The effect of his prayer is told by our Lord Himself: the man went down to his house justified (v. 19), which means that God was propitiated and reconciled with the publican. In the Epistle to the Hebrews (II, 17) the double notion is clearly discerned. We learn (v. 3) of the salvation (*σωτηρίας*) procured for us by Christ. Through His passion He vanquished satan and delivered those who were subject to him (10-15). Therefore in all things Christ became like unto His brethren, that He might become a merciful and faithful High Priest before God and might expiate the sins of the people—*εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ.* Christ's piacular sacrifice for sins brought salvation to the world and placated His Father.

The noun *ἱλασμός* occurs twice in the Johannine epistles. St. John exhorts his readers to avoid sin. But should they be so unfortunate as to fall into sin, then they need not despair for Jesus Christ the Just is our advocate with the Father (I John II, 1). Not only is He our advocate but "*αὐτὸς ἱλασμός ἐστιν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν*"; and not merely for our sins but also for those of the whole world (v. 2). Sin was taken away by Jesus Christ and to do so He appeared on earth (III, 4-8). We, therefore, must learn to love God as He has loved us; for out of love for us He sent His only begotten Son into the world (IV, 7-9). It was God who loved us first and, as manifestation of His love, "*ἀπέστειλεν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἱλασμὸν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν*" (IV, 10). As the context shows sin is considered as the evil oppressing mankind. This God removed when He sent His Son who made expiation for all sins. The emphasis that we should love God as He loved us points to propitiation,—both of these acts being accomplished by means of Christ's sacrifice. St. John uses *ἱλασμός* in its usual sense of means of expiation and propitiation.

Excepting Rom. III, 25, *ἱλαστήριον* is found but once and that in the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is significant that in this instance it is used in its original local sense. The writer explains the superiority of the N. T. to that of the Old. The priesthood of Christ excells the Levitical priesthood (VII-VIII). Then follows mention of the tabernacle, its divisions and contents, the author

stating that in the Holy of Holies were the cherubim overshadowing the propitiatory — χερουβὶμ δόξης κατασκιάζοντα τὸ ἱλαστήριον (IX, 1-5). The sacrifice of Christ is then described as the fulfillment of all O. T. sacrifices; in particular He is the High Priest who, with His own blood, entered but once into the holies and obtained eternal redemption (6-28). The entire ninth chapter is an accumulation of figurative expressions in relation to Christ.

The meaning of ἱλαστήριον in Rom. III, 25 will be firmly established if the sense, as furnished by the historico-literary investigation of the word, is applicable to this verse, and if the general and immediate context confirm this application.

2. Ἱλαστήριον in Rom. III, 25

A. A word must be added concerning the *use* of ἱλαστήριον by St. Paul. Moderns have discussed this considerably, and the generally accepted opinion is, that the Apostle employed the term not as adjective but as substantive. Patristic exegesis, which often even made the application of the term to Christ more emphatic by the addition of the article τό, also demands the substantive use. The literary investigation likewise requires the same conclusion. Wherefore we hold, as our exegesis has already shown, that St. Paul used the term not as adjective but as substantive.

B. *The Context of Rom.* III, 25. In Rom. I, 16-17 St. Paul states the theme of his epistle, which is that the Gospel "is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, to the Jew first, and to the Greek. For the justice of God is revealed therein, from faith unto faith". In contrast to the true gospel, pagan religion with its false philosophy, void of faith and humility, betrays its adherents into shameful sins (I, 18-32). The state of the Jewish people, however, is not different. They condemn the Gentiles, yet do the same things (II, 1-4). Because of the sinfulness of all men, therefore, the just judgment of God will fall upon them, for there is no respect of persons with God (II, 5-11). The Gentiles have as their norm the law of nature and their conscience, but if they are only hearers thereof and not doers, they shall not be justified (II, 12-16). And the Jew, despite his priority of knowledge of God's law, has failed in its observance. His circumcision, therefore, is no better for him than the uncircumcision of the heathen. For, not he is a Jew who is such only outwardly, but he who is so inwardly and in reality (II, 17-29). Their advantages notwithstanding, the Jews have proven unfaithful; and their

perfidy is inexcusable (III, 1-8). These are the conditions as the Apostle views them, and he arraigns "both Jews and Greeks that they are all under sin" (III, 9). Universal failure is the result; Jew and Gentile alike stand guilty before God. To give his argument more weight the Apostle adds proof from the O. T. (III, 9-20).

St. Paul has now stated his problem which is the universality of sin. He proceeds to explain the universal remedy for this universal failure. This new way of salvation, which is the gift of God bestowed on man and manifesting the justice of God, is open to every one that believeth; and, while independent of the law, it is attested "by the law and the prophets" (III, 21). It is universal in extent, being obtainable "by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all and upon all them that believe in Him" (III, 22). Now, therefore, there is no further distinction between Jew and Gentile, because all have sinned and stand in need of the visible glory and divine manifestation of God in His Son (III, 23). In this, the *general context,* St. Paul points out the universality of sin and contrasts to it the universal salvation which is the new way of justification. On the part of God, this new way is a free gift, and, on the part of man, it is not merely a confidence in God's mercy which results in the certainty of salvation, but a co-operation of man's free will and intellect with the grace of God whereby man becomes righteous.

And now in three verses, the *immediate context,* St. Paul explains in detail this new way of justification; and this marks our arrival, as Deissmann well words it, "an der tiefgründigen Stelle Röm 3, 25".[4] In v. 24 the Apostle states that no man merited justification, but it was a free gift on the part of God and was obtained "*διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*", that is, the redemption procured by paying a ransom which was the blood of Christ. Thus he has prepared us for his most emphatic statement, which is: *ὃν προέθετο ὁ Θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι.* In these words the redemption is described in a most vivid and realistic way. The verb *προέθετο* (set forth) refers to the manner of exhibiting Christ as *ἱλαστήριον* and, as Lightfoot correctly says, the force of the preposition *πρό* "is not temporal, but local".[5] The phrase *διὰ τῆς πίστεως,* which indicates the source of righteousness and the principal channel of applying to ourselves the effects of the *ἀπολυτρώσεως,* testifies to the *reality* of Christ as *ἱλαστήριον.* Likewise the words *ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι,*—the means of

[4] Op. cit., 208.
[5] Op. cit., 271.

the redemption, distinctly remind us of *reality* because Christ is ἱλαστήριον in His own blood. Immediately there comes to mind the oft repeated statement of patristic interpretation, especially the Greek, that Christ as ἱλαστήριον is the reality (ἀλήθεια) in contrast to the O. T. mere appearance (τύπος); also the statement that Christ is the universal ἱλαστήριον in contrast to the ἱλαστήριον of the O. T., which was exclusively for the Israelites. Hence, what the ἱλαστήριον in the Holy of Holies was for the Israelites only, that Christ is now become for all: the universal remedy for the universality of sin by His sacrifice. In this one word, in which lies "the key to the conception of Christ's atoning death", as Vincent[6] aptly remarks, St. Paul gives the solution of his thesis that the Gospel is the power of salvation to all. Does the primary, literal meaning of ἱλαστήριον, which the investigation made manifest, also find application in this 25th verse? Beyond all doubt it does. God has set forth Christ (the N. T. universal reality in contrast to the O. T. particular type) to become by the sacrifice of His own blood the place where God's righteousness is shown to be completely propitiated—εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ, and where former sins are passed over—διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων. And faith guarantees the reality of this antitype. In v. 26 St. Paul continues the explanation. Seemingly unconcerned, God looked on at the triumph of sin under the old dispensation. But now, in setting forth His Son as the place of expiation and propitiation, His righteousness is made manifest and He makes righteous him who is of the faith of Jesus Christ. Wherefore, justification consists not in the mere covering of sin and an external declaration of man's being justified, but in the complete removal and forgiveness of sin and an internal sanctification.

This interpretation is confirmed by what follows in the context. If Christ by His own blood has become localized expiation and propitiation, then, as a consequence, all boasting on the part of man must cease, since man is made righteous by a real faith in Jesus Christ without the works of the law (III, 27-28). The second consequence is that the redemption is universal, including Jew and Gentile alike (III, 29-31). Accordingly, we see that the general as well as the immediate context of Rom. III, 25 fully admits the interpretation of ἱλαστήριον in its fundamental literal sense. Such an interpretation would also be intelligible to St. Paul's readers. The objection is raised by Sanday-Headlam,

[6] Op. cit., 43.

Lightfoot, and others, that to identify Christ with the O. T. place of expiation and propitiation, is an unsuitable and confusing application since it makes Him at once priest and victim and the actual place. This is well answered by Boehmer [7] who argues that if Christ can be described as entering the Holy of Holies with His own blood (Hebr. IX, 12), "warum soll Paulus nicht . . . den blutüberströmten Leib Jesu mit dem blutbesprengten Deckel der Bundeslade verglichen haben . . ?" Other modern exegetes assert that the application of ἱλαστήριον to Christ as the antitype of the O. T. type would be meaningless to the Gentile readers of the Epistle, since they lacked the preliminary notions upon which that figure is predicated, namely, the temple, propitiatory, sacrifices, etc. But they seem to forget that a large portion of the Gentile Christians "approached Christianity through the portals of a previous connexion with Judaism".[8] A fortiori could St. Paul presuppose a knowledge of the most important ceremony of expiation and propitiation, which centered around the כַּפֹּרֶת on the part of the σεβόμενοι τὸν Θεόν, those Gentiles who feared the one God of the Jews, who observed some of the O. T. laws, and who constituted the seed plot of Christianity in the early Christian Church. Again, those commentators, who maintain that the Pauline word has nothing in common with the O. T. ἱλαστήριον, are confronted with the serious difficulty of explaining the unanimous testimony of the Greek Fathers that Christ as ἱλαστήριον is the reality and antitype of the O. T. symbol and type.

Conclusion

We now possess a definite and positive knowledge of the Pauline ἱλαστήριον. The sources of information regarding the elements contained in the root-verb are undoubtedly profane Greek and the LXX. The substantive ἱλαστήριον, with its inherent notion of locality, St. Paul took from the LXX, the birthplace of the term. Especially the use of this word by the LXX to designate the particular place within the Holy of Holies, showed St. Paul the fitness and appropriateness of its application to Christ. In applying that one term to Christ he could concisely and precisely embody his belief in the divinity and humanity of Christ, as well as clearly express the reason and result of Christ's sacrifice. With this one

[7] Heilslehre nach d. Römerbriefe, 11.

[8] Sanday-Headlam, op. cit., xxxiv.

word, then, the Apostle teaches that, as God manifested His presence from over the O. T. ἱλαστήριον, so now He manifests His presence in the person of His Son; and, as the blood of the sin-offering made expiation for sins and propitiated God, thus reconciling Him with the Israelites, so now Christ in His own blood expiated all sins and propitiated God, thus reconciling Him with mankind.

We can say that the term ἱλαστήριον is difficult to grasp only because of the numerous ideas for which it stands. We now know that Christ as ἱλαστήριον sums up in Himself all these ideas. One and the same word thus stands for both the reason and effect of Christ's atoning death,—the former: to expiate sin, to propitiate His Father, and thus to reconcile Him with man; the latter: universal redemption and salvation. St. Paul's concept of ἱλαστήριον, then, is this:—By faith we have the guarantee that Jesus Christ was set forth by His Father to manifest His divinity, and to become **the place where, by His own blood, real expiation for sin was made and propitiation of a just God accomplished, thus effecting reconciliation between an offended God and sinful man.**

ABBREVIATIONS

BS—Bible Studies

DAC—Hastings, Dictionary of the Apostolic Church

EBi—Encyclopaedia Biblica

ERE—Hastings, Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics

ExpT—The Expository Times

HBD—Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible

JE—Jewish Encyclopaedia

KAT^3—Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament (Zimmern)

MPG—Migne, Patrologia Graeca

MPL—Migne, Patrologia Latina

REA—Real-Encyclopädie der Christlichen Alterthümer

StKr—Studien und Kritiken

ZntlW—Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(The Patristic literature is taken from Migne, P. G. and P. L., and is not included in this Bibliography.)

Abbott, Lyman, The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans, New York and Chicago, 1888.

Acta Sanctorum Maii, Tom. 5, Baertio, Fran. et Ianningo, Con., Parisiis et Romae, 1866.

Agus, Josephus, S. J., Epistola Beati Pauli Apostoli ad Romanos, Ratisbonae et Neo Eboraci, 1888.

Albertus, Joannes, Hesychii Lexicon, Tom. 2, Lugduni Batavorum, 1746.

Alford, Henry, The Greek Testament,[6] Vol. 2, London, 1865.

Alting, Jacobi, Operum, Tom. 3, Amstelaedami, 1686.

Bähr, Karl Christ. Wilh., Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus, Vol. 1, Heidelberg, 1837.

Bardenhewer, Otto, Patrology, The Lives and Works of the Fathers of the Church, Translated from the Second Edition by Thomas J. Shahan, Freiburg im Breisgau and St. Louis, Mo., 1908.

Barnes, Albert, Notes, Explanatory and Practical on the Epistle to the Romans,[10] New York, 1871.

Baur, Ferdinand Christ., Paulus, Der Apostel Jesu Christi, Stuttgart, 1845.

Beck, J. T., Erklärung des Briefes Pauli an die Römer, Gütersloh, 1884.

Beelen, Joan. Theod., Commentarius in Epistolam S. Pauli ad Romanos, Louvanii, 1854.

Beet, Joseph Agar, Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans,[7] New York, 1891.

Bekker, Immanuel, Suidae Lexicon, Berolini, 1854.

Belsham, Thomas, The Epistles of Paul the Apostle, Vol. 1, London, 1822.

Bengel, John Albert, Gnomon of the New Testament, A New Translation by C. T. Lewis and M. R. Vincent, Vol. 2, Philadelphia, 1861.

Bernardini a Piconio, Epistolarum B. Pauli Apostoli Triplex Expositio, Tom. 1, Parisiis, 1842.

Bernstein, Ignaz, Jüdische Sprichwörter und Redensarten,[2] Warschau, 1908.

Beyschlag, Willibald, Neutestamentliche Theologie, Vol. 2, Halle a. S., 1892.

Bibel, Die, Nach der Deutschen Uebersetzung Martin Luthers, Cöln, 1876.

Bisping, August, Erklärung des Briefes an die Römer,[3] Münster, 1870.

Bleibtreu, Walter, Der Abschnitt Röm. 3, 21-26, StKr (1883).

Boehmer, Die Heilslehre des Apostels Paulus nach dem Römerbriefe dargestellt, Conitz, 1881.

Bonaventurae, S. Doctoris, Opera, Tom. 3, Quaracchi, 1887.

Bosanquet, Edwin, A Verbal Paraphrase of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, London, 1840.

Bree, William Thomas, The Plain Reader's Help in the Study of the Holy Scriptures, Vol. 2, Coventry, 1822.

Bretschneider, Car. G., Lexicon Manuale Graeco-Latinum in Libros Novi Testamenti, Tom. 1, Lipsiae, 1829.

Briggs, Charles Augustus, The Messiah of the Apostles, New York, 1895.

Brown, David, The Epistle to the Romans, Edinburgh, 1883.

Brown, Francis, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, Based on the Lexicon of W. Gesenius, Boston and New York, 1907.

Brown, John, An Exposition of the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans, Edinburgh, 1766.

Bruston, C., Les Consequences du Vrae Sens de ΙΑΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ, ZntlW (1906).

Burkitt, William, Expository Notes with Practical Observations on the New Testament, London, 1716.
Bushnell, Horace, The Vicarious Sacrifice, Vol. 1, New York, 1877.
Butler, Alfred J., The Ancient Coptic Churches of Egypt, Vol. 2, Oxford, 1884.

Calmet, Augustini, Commentarius Literalis in Omnes Libros Veteris et Novi Testamenti, Ed. Joannes D. Mansi, Tom. 8, Lucae, 1738.
Calvini, Joannis, Commentarii in Omnes Pauli Apostoli Epistolas, Lutetiae, 1556.
Castalione, Sebastiano, Interprete Biblia, Una cum eiusdem Annotationibus, Basileae, 1551.
Chalmers, Thomas, Lectures on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans, New York, 1854.
Clark, George W., Romans and I and II Corinthians, Philadelphia, 1897. (A People's Commentary.)
Clarke, James Freeman, The Ideas of the Apostle Paul, Boston, 1884.
Clericus, Joannes, Epistolae Sanctorum Apostolorum et Apocalypsis S. Joannis,[2] Francofurti, 1714.
Cone, Orello, Paul, the Man, the Missionary, and the Teacher, London, 1898.
Conybeare, W. J. and Howson, J. S., The Life and the Epistles of St. Paul, Vol. 2, London, 1853.
Coptic Version, The, of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect, otherwise called Sahidic and Thebaic, Vol. 4, The Epistles of St. Paul, Oxford, 1920.
Cornelii a Lapide, S. J., Commentaria in Scripturam Sacram accurate recognovit ac notis illustravit Augustinus Crampton, Tom. 1, Parisiis, 1859, Tom. 18, Parisiis, 1861.
Cornely, Rudolfus, S. J., Commentarius in S. Pauli Apostoli Epistolas. Epistola ad Romanos, Parisiis, 1896. (Cursus Scripturae Sacrae.)
Cowles, Henry, The Longer Epistle of Paul, viz., Romans, I and II Corinthians, New York, 1880.
Cremer, Hermann, Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch der Neutestamentlichen Gräcität,[9] Gotha, 1902.
Critici Sacri, Tom. 7, Exhibens Annotata in Epistolam ad Romanos, etc., Amstelaedami, 1698.

Daniel, Hermanus A., Codex Liturgicus Ecclesiae Orientalis, Tom. 4, Lipsiae, 1853.
Deissmann, Adolf, Bible Studies,[2] Authorized Translation by Alexander Grieve, Edinburgh, 1909.
Deissmann, Adolf, ΙΑΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΣ und ΙΑΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ, Eine Lexikalische Studie, ZntlW (1903).
Denney, James, St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, London, 1900. (Expositor's Greek Testament, Vol. 2.)
De Wette, W. M. L., Kurze Erklärung des Briefes an die Römer,[4] Leipzig, 1847.
Dibellius, Martin, Die Lade Jahves, Eine Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung, Göttingen, 1906.
Dillmann, August, Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus,[3] Leipzig, 1897.
Diodati, John, Pious and Learned Annotations upon the Holy Bible,[3] London, 1651.
Drummond, James, The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Thessalonians, Corinthians, Galatians, Romans and Philippians, New York and London, 1899.
DuCange, Carolus, Glossarium ad Scriptores Mediae et Infimae Graecitatis, Tom. 1, Lugduni, 1688.

Eisenmenger, Johannes Andreas, Entdecktes Judenthum, Königsberg in Preussen, 1711.

Elsner, Jacobi, Observationes Sacrae in Novi Foederis Libros, Tom. 2, Trajecti ad Rhenum, 1728.
Encyclopaedia Biblica, Edited by T. K. Cheyne and J. Sutherland Black, Vol. 4, London, 1903.
Estii, Guilielmi, In Omnes D. Pauli Epistolas, item in Catholicas, Commentarii, Tom. 1, Moguntiae, 1858.

Feine, Paul, Theologie des Neuen Testaments,[2] Leipzig, 1912.
Field, Fridericus, Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt, sive Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in Totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta, Tom. 1, Oxonii, 1875.
Flavii, Josephi, Opera, quae reperiri potuerunt, Omnia, Ed. Joannes Hudson, Oxonii, 1720.
Forbes, John, Analytical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, Edinburgh, 1868.
Ford, D. B., Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, Philadelphia, 1889.
Fritzsche, Car. Frid. Aug., Pauli ad Romanos Epistola, Tom. 1, Halis Saxonum, 1836.
Funke, George, Ein Dogmatisch-exegetischer Versuch über Röm. 3, 25 und 26, StKr (1842).

Gaebelein, A. C., The Epistle to the Romans, New York, 1916.
Gesenii, Gulielmi, Thesaurus Philologicus Criticus Linguae Hebraeae et Chaldaeae Veteris Testamenti, Tom. 2, Lipsiae, 1839.
Gifford, E. H., Commentary on Romans, New York, 1886. (The Bible Commentary, Vol. 3.)
Godet, F., Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, Translated from the French by A. Cusin; Translation Revised and Edited by Talbot W. Chambers, New York, 1889.
Godwin, John H., The Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Romans, London, 1873.
Goldschmidt, Lazarus, Der Babylonische Talmud, 8 Vols., Berlin, 1897-1914.
Gray, James C., The Biblical Museum, A Collection of Notes to the Holy Scriptures, Revised by G. M. Adams, Vol. 2, New York, 1898.
Grenfell, B. P. and Hunt, A. S., Fayum Towns and their Papyri, London, 1900.
Grimm, Carlo Lud. Willib., Lexicon Graeco-Latinum in Libros Novi Testamenti, Lipsiae, 1868.
Grotii, Hugonis, Operum Theologicorum, Tomus Tertius continens Annotationes in Epistolas Apostolicas et Apocalypsim, Basileae, 1732.
Gurlitt, J. F. K., Studien zur Erklärung Rom. 3, 25, StKr (1840).
Guyse, John, The Practical Expositor or an Exposition of the New Testament,[2] Vol. 3, Edinburgh, 1775.

Hammond, H., A Paraphrase and Annotations upon all the Books of the New Testament, London, 1702.
Hastings, James, Dictionary of the Bible, edited by, New York, 1909.
Hastings, James, Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, edited by, New York, Vol. 1, 1908; Vol. 5, 1914; Vol. 10, 1920; Vol. 11, 1921.
Hastings, James, Dictionary of the Apostolic Church, Vol. 2, New York, 1918.
Henry, Mathew, An Exposition of the Old and New Testament, Vol. 9, London, 1866.
Hesychii, Lexicon, Ex autographis partim recensuit, partim nunc primum edidit, suasque adimadversiones perpetuas adjecit Joannes Alberti, Tom. 2, Lugduni Batavorum, 1766.
Hobart, Alvah S., Transplanted Truths or Expositions of Great Texts in Romans, Philadelphia, 1919.
Hodge, Charles, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, London, 1837.
Hofmann, J. Chr. K. v., Der Schriftbeweis, der zweiten Hälfte erste Abteilung, Nördlingen, 1853.

Hofmann, J. Chr. K. v., Die Heilige Schrift Neuen Testaments, Dritter Teil, Nördlingen, 1868.
Holden, George, The Christian Expositor, Vol. 2, New Testament, London (no date).
Holtzmann, Heinrich Julius, Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen Theologie,[2] Tübingen, 1911.
Horner, G., The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect, Vol. 3, Oxford, 1905.

Jacobs, Henry E., Annotations on the Epistles of Paul to the Romans and I Corinthians, Chaps. I-VI, New York, 1896. (Lutheran Commentary, Vol. 7.)
Jowett, Benjamin, The Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians, and Romans,[2] Vol. 2, London, 1859.
Jülicher, Adolf, Der Brief an die Römer, Göttingen, 1908. (Die Schriften des Neuen Testamentes,[2] Band 2.)

Kahnis, Karl Fried. Aug., Die Lutherische Dogmatik, Vol. 1, Leipzig, 1861.
Kneeland, Abner, The New Testament in Greek and English, Vol. 2, Philadelphia, 1823.
Knight, Robert, A Critical Commentary on the Epistle of St. Paul the Apostle to the Romans, London, 1854.
König, Edward, Historisch-Kritisches Lehrgebäude der Hebräischen Sprache, Vol. 2, Leipzig, 1895.
Koppe, Joh. Benj., Novum Testamentum Graece,[3] Tom. 4, Gottingae, 1824.
Kraus, F. X., Real-Encyclopädie der Christlichen Alterthümer, Freiburg im Breisgau, Band 1, 1882, Band 2, 1886.
Krüger, Theodor, Die Rechtfertigung nach dem Lehrbegriff des Briefes Pauli an die Römer, Bromberg, 1892.
Kypke, Georgii Davidis, Observationes Sacrae in Novi Foederis Libros, Tom. 1, Wratislaviae, 1755.

Lagarde de, Paul, Uebersicht über die im Aramäischen, Arabischen, und Hebräischen übliche Bildung der Nomina, Göttingen, 1889.
LaGrange, P. M. J., Saint Paul Epitre aux Romains, Paris, 1916.
Lange, John Peter, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, Translated from the German by J. F. Hurst, Revised, enlarged and edited by P. Schaff, New York, 1870. (A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures, Vol. 5.)
Lattey, Cuthbert, S. J., The Epistle to the Romans, London, 1920. (Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures, Vol. 3, Part 4.)
Lechner, Petrus, Die Heilige Schrift des Neuen Testamentes, München, 1881.
Liddell, Henry G. and Scott, Robert, A Greek-English Lexicon,[8] New York, 1897.
Lightfoot, J. B., Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul, London, 1904.
Lipsius, Richard A., Die Paulinische Rechtfertigungslehre, Leipzig, 1853.
Locke, John, A Paraphrase and Notes on the Epistles of Paul to the Galatians, Corinthians, Romans, and Ephesians, London, 1824. (The Works of J. Locke, Vol. 7.)
Luthardt, Chr. Ernst, Der Brief Pauli an die Römer, Nördlingen, 1887.

MacEvilly, John, An Exposition of the Epistles of St. Paul and of the Catholic Epistles, Vol. 1, Dublin, 1898.
McGarvey, J. W. and Pendleton, P. Y., Thessalonians, Corinthians, Galatians, and Romans, Cincinnati, 1916. (The Standard Bible Commentary.)
Macknight, James, A New Literal Translation from the Original Greek of all the Apostolical Epistles, Philadelphia, 1835.
Menochii, Joannis Stephani, Commentarii Totius Sacrae Scripturae, Tom. 2, Avenione, 1768.
Meyer, Heinrich, Aug. Wilh., Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch über den Brief des Paulus an die Römer,[4] Göttingen, 1865.

Miller, John, Commentary of Paul's Epistle to the Romans, Princeton, 1887.
Morison, James, A Critical Exposition of the Third Chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Romans, London, 1866.
Moule, Handley, C. G., The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans, Cambridge, 1879. (The Cambridge Bible.)
Moule, Handley C. G., The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans, New York, 1894. (The Expositor's Bible.)
Moulton, J. H. and Milligan, G., The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, London, Parts I and II, 1915, Part IV, 1920.

New Testament, The, In an improved Version upon the Basis of Archbishop Newcome's New Translation, Boston, 1809.

Olshausen, Herman, Biblical Commentary on the New Testament, Translated from the German for Foreign Theological Library, revised after the Fourth German Edition by A. C. Kendrick, Vol. 3, New York, 1863.
Orfali, Gaudentius, O. F. M., De Arca Foederis, Parisiis, 1918.
Otto, E., Erklärung des Briefes Pauli an die Römer, St. Louis, 1883.

Paige, Lucius R., A Commentary on the New Testament, Vol. 4, The Epistle to the Romans, Boston, 1857.
Parry, R. St. John, The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans, Cambridge, 1912.
Paton, W. R. and Hicks, E. L., The Inscriptions of Cos, Oxford, 1891.
Philippi, Friedrich Adolph, Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, Translated from the Third Improved and Enlarged Edition by J. S. Banks, Vol. 1, Edinburgh, 1878.
Philonis, Judaei, Opera Quae Reperiri Potuerunt Omnia, etc., Ed. Thomas Mangey, London, 1742.
Plumer, William S., Commentary on Paul's Epistle to the Romans, New York, 1870.
Pool, Mathew, Annotations upon the Holy Bible, Vol. 3, New York, 1853.
Prat, F., La Theologie de Saint Paul,[5] Première Partie, Paris, 1913.
Preuschen, Edwin, Griechisch-Deutsches Handwörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testamentes, Gieszen, 1910.
Priestley, Joseph, Notes on all the Books of Scripture, Vol. 4, Northumberland, 1804.

Rashdall, Hastings, The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology, London, 1920.
Reischl, Wilhelm, Die Heilige Schrift des Neuen Testaments, Regensburg, 1866.
Ripley, Henry J., The Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Romans, Boston, 1857.
Ritschl, Albrecht, Die Christliche Lehre von der Rechfertigung und Versöhnung,[3] Vol. 2, Bonn, 1882.
Robertson, A. T., A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research,[3] New York, 1919.
Robinson, Edward, A Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament, Boston, 1836.
Rosenmulleri, Jo. Georgii, Scholia in Novum Testamentum, Tom. 3, Norimbergae, 1829.
Rückert, L. J., Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Römer, Vol. 1, Leipzig, 1839.

Salianus, Jacobus, Annalium Ecclesiasticorum Veteris Testamenti Epitome, Rothomagi, 1655.
Sanday, William and Headlam, Arthur, The Epistle to the Romans, New York, 1922. (International Critical Commentary.)
Sanders, Daniel, Wörterbuch der Deutschen Sprache, Vol. 1, Leipzig, 1876.
Schaefer, Aloys, Erklärung des Briefes an die Römer, Münster i. W., 1891.
Schaff, Philip, A Popular Commentary on the New Testament, Vol. 3, Edinburgh, 1883.

Schleusner, Joh. Fried., Novus Thesaurus Philologico-Criticus, Sive Lexicon in LXX et Reliquos Interpretes Graecos ac Scriptores Apocryphos Veteris Testamenti, Tom. 3, Lipsiae, 1821.
Schleusner, Joh. Fried., Novum Lexicon Graeco-Latinum in Novum Testamentum, Tom. 1, Londini, 1829.
Schweizer, Alex., Die Lehre des Apostels Paulus vom Erlösenden Tode Christi, StKr (1858).
Scofield, Cyrus I., The New Testament and Psalms, New York, 1920.
Seeberg, Alfred, Der Tod Christi in Seiner Bedeutung für die Erlösung, Leipzig, 1895.
Shedd, William G. T., A Critical and Doctrinal Commentary upon the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans, New York, 1893.
Sheldon, Henry C., New Testament Theology, New York, 1911.
Sickenberger, Joseph, Die Beiden Briefe des Hl. Paulus and die Korinther, und sein Brief an die Römer, Bonn, 1919.
Stevens, George Baker, The Theology of the New Testament, New York, 1899.
Stifler, James M., The Epistle to the Romans, New York, 1897.
Storrer, J., Der Brief Pauli an die Römer, Buffalo, 1890.
Stuart, Moses, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans,[5] London, 1853.
Suiceri, Joh. Caspari, Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus e Patribus Graecis,[3] Tom. 1, Trajecti ad Rhenum, 1746.
Suidae Lexicon, Graece et Latine, Tom. 2, Ed. Ludolphus Kusterus, Cantabrigiae, 1705.

Taylor, John A., A Paraphrase with Notes on the Epistle to the Romans,[3] London, 1754.
Thayer, Joseph Henry, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, Being Grimm's Wilke's Clavis Novi Testamenti, Translated, Revised and Enlarged, New York, 1889.
Tholuck, Friedrich Aug. Gott., Auslegung des Briefes Pauli an die Römer,[2] Berlin, 1828.
Tirini, Jacobi, In Universam S. Scripturam Commentarius, Tom. 4, Taurini, 1883.
Tixeront, J., A Handbook of Patrology, Authorized Translation, Based upon the Fourth French Edition, St. Louis, 1920.
Tostati, Alphonsi, Operum, Tom. 2, Continens Commentaria in Exodum, Coloniae Aggrippinae, 1613.
Trollope, William, Analecta Theologica, A Critical, Philological, and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, Vol. 2, London, 1842.

Usteri, Leonhard, Entwicklung des Paulinischen Lehrbegriffes,[5] Zurich, 1834.

Vaughan, C. J., St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans with Notes, London, 1893.
Vincent, Marvin R., Word Studies in the New Testament, Vol. 3, New York, 1890.
Vitringa, Campegi, Archisynagogus Observationibus Novis Illustratus, Franequerae, 1686.

Wahl, Christ. Abraham, Clavis Novi Testamenti Philologica,[3] Lipsiae, 1843.
Wardlaw, Ralph, Two Essays: I, On the Assurance of Faith, II, On the Extent of the Atonement and Universal Pardon, New York, 1830.
Weber, Ferdinand, Vom Zorne Gottes, Erlangen, 1862.
Weidner, Revere Franklin, Biblical Theology of the New Testament, New York.
Weigand, Fr. L. K., Deutsches Wörterbuch, Herausgegeben von Hermann Hirt, Vol. 1, Gieszen, 1909.
Weinel, H., St. Paul, The Man, and His Work, Translated by G. A. Bienemann and Edited by W. D. Morrison, London, 1906.

Weiss, Bernhard, Die Paulinischen Briefe und der Hebräerbrief,[2] Leipzig, 1902.
Weiss, Bernhard, Das Neue Testament nach D. Martin Luthers berichtiger Uebersetzung, Vol. 2, Leipzig, 1907.
Whedon, D. D., Commentary on the New Testament, Vol. 3, New York, 1871.
Whitby, Daniel, A Critical Commentary and Paraphrase on the Old and New Testament, Vol. 4, Philadelphia, 1864.
Winer, George Benedict, A Grammar of the New Testament Diction, Translated from the Sixth Edition of the Original by Edward Masson, Edinburgh, 1861.
Winer, George Benedict, Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms, Achte Auflage neubearbeitet von Paul W. Schmiedel, Vol. 1, Göttingen, 1894.
Wordsworth, Chr., The New Testament of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ in the Original Greek, London, 1861.

Zahn, Theodor, Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer,[2] Leipzig, 1910.
Zeller, Paul, Biblisches Handwörterbuch,[3] Stuttgart, 1912.
Zimmern, H., Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament,[3] Berlin, 1903.
Zorell, Fran. S. J., Novi Testamenti Lexicon Graecum, Parisiis, 1911.

Universitas Catholica Americae

Washington, D. C.

S. Facultas Theologica, 1922-1923

No. 21.

THESES

DEUS LUX MEA

THESES

QUAS

AD DOCTORIS GRADUM

IN

SACRA THEOLOGIA

APUD UNIVERSITATEM CATHOLICAM AMERICAE

CONSEQUENDUM

PUBLICE PROPUGNABIT

ROMUALDUS ALPHONSUS MOLLAUN, O. F. M.

PROVINCIAE S. JOANNIS BAPTISTAE CINCINNATENSIS

SACRAE THEOLOGIAE LICENTIATUS

THESES

I

The importance of Rome for the propagation of Christianity was the motive for St. Paul's epistle to the Romans.

II

The humanitarian and universalistic ideas of Stoicism, which were permeating Roman society at the time of the epistle to the Romans, paved the way for the new universalism of the gospel of Christ.

III

At the time of St. Paul's epistle to the Romans the Jewish element in the Roman community was well organized, influential, and enjoyed imperial privileges.

IV

The Gentiles in the Roman community, who sought a higher notion of God and who observed a part of the Jewish law constituted a fertile seed plot for Christianity.

V

The arguments adduced by modern criticism to explain the foundation of the Church at Rome by some disciples of St. Paul are not conclusive.

VI

The best substantiated and more probable opinion is that the Church at Rome was founded by St. Peter.

VII

In the introduction to the epistle to the Romans (I, 1-7) St. Paul sets forth a remarkable theological compendium.

VIII

In New Testament writings δικαιόω does not signify to declare righteous, but to make righteous by the removal of sin.

IX

Ἱλαστήριον in Rom. III, 25 designates Christ as the real sacrificial place of expiation and propitiation.

X

The literary source for the Pauline usage of ἱλαστήριον was ultimately the LXX.

XI

That the Pauline term in Rom. III, 25 describes Christ as the reality of the Old Testament symbol is distinctly shown by the unanimous testimony of the Greek Fathers.

XII

Deissmann's interpretation of ἱλαστήριον in Rom. III, 25 as a *means of expiation or propitiation* or as a *propitiatory gift* is a perversion of the natural historical development of the term.

XIII

The application of the term ἱλαστήριον to statues and monuments demands the meaning of a real or symbolic place of expiation and propitiation.

XIV

The application of the term ἱλαστήριον to churches, monasteries, sanctuaries, altars, etc., and also the characteristic tendency of words ending in τήριον offer further evidence that the fundamental meaning of the word is that of locality.

XV

In Rom. III, 25 the phrases "through faith" and "in His blood" refer to the reality of Christ's sacrifice.

XVI

In profane Greek literature the root-verb ἱλάσκεσθαι contains the elements of expiation and propitiation, which were accomplished by the means of sacrifice or offering.

XVII

The omission of chapters XV and XVI of the epistle to the Romans in several MSS. and some Fathers is due to the influence exercised by the text of Marcion.

XVIII

Despite the difficulties surrounding the address of salutation in Rom. XVI, 1-24, the integrity of these verses can be successfully defended.

XIX

The literary problem in the Synoptic question cannot be solved by the so-called theory of Oral Tradition.

XX

The best solution to the Synoptic problem seems to be that the evangelists made use of pre-gospel sources, which originated in Jerusalem.

XXI

Many objections of modern criticism against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch can be satisfactorily answered by applying the principles enunciated by the Biblical Commission on June 27, 1906.

XXII

The arguments advanced by the advocates of the development hypothesis against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch are neither conclusive nor convincing.

XXIII

The external and internal evidence furnishes a powerful argument for the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

XXIV

The numerous and striking coincidences between the biblical (Gen. I, 1-II, 4) and the Assyro-Babylonian account of the creation, must be explained by this that both had for a common basis an early tradition.

XXV

The similarities between the scriptural report of the flood and that of the Gilgamēs Epos do not postulate a dependence of the former upon the latter.

XXVI

A comparison of Hammurabi's laws with the Mosaic decrees reveals some similarities, but there is no suggestion that the latter are modeled upon or borrowed from the former.

XXVII

The differences in the canon of the Old Testament, as formulated by the

Council of Trent and that defended by Origen and St. Jerome, may be accounted for by the different tests of canonicity used.

XXVIII

The view of some critics that the discourses of Eliu (Job. XXXI, 1-XXXVII, 24) are a later interpolation is untenable from a linguistic as well as from the contextual standpoint.

XXIX

Rom. I, 18-23 plainly manifests a literary dependence on Wis. XII, 24-XIII, 10.

XXX

The Old Testament usage of ἱλάσκεσθαι—כָּפַר shows that the term contains the notions of expiation and propitiation, which were ordinarily effected by the means of sacrifice.

XXXI

The existence of God can be certainly known by the natural light of human reason through created things.

XXXII

Holy Scripture and Patristic teaching bear testimony to the immediate creation by God of the body and soul of the first man.

XXXIII

St. Paul's doctrine on justification is clearly set forth in Rom. III, 21-30.

XXIV

Patristic exegesis offers conclusive evidence that the term ἱλαστήριον in Rom. III, 25 contains a profession of Christ's divinity.

XXV

"The Blessed Virgin Mary, in the first instant of her conception, by a singular grace and privilege granted to her by Almighty God, through the merits of Jesus Christ, Saviour of mankind, was preserved from all stain of original sin." (Ineffabilis Deus, Pius IX, Dec. 8, 1854.)

XXXVI

The wonderful cures of Christ cannot adequately be explained as effects brought about through the natural agency of powerful suggestion.

XXXVII

The miracles related of Jesus in the Gospels, resting as they do on the unimpeachable testimony of eye-witnesses, cannot rightly be impugned.

XXXVIII

The conviction of the Apostles that Jesus arose from the dead, cannot satisfactorily be accounted for apart from the reality of the resurrection.

XXXIX

The note of Catholicity is verified in the Roman Catholic Church alone.

XL

A strong proof of the divine origin of Christianity is to be found in its extraordinary spread in the first two centuries.

XLI

The theory of Kant, that a person has a right to do everything that does not interfere with the equal liberty of others, is incapable of application if interpreted objectively; understood in a completely subjective sense, it would justify and legalize unlawful conduct.

XLII

The assertion that rights are derived from society, that they exist for a social end, and should be exercised chiefly for the social welfare, is unjustifiable and unwarranted.

XLIII

Certain rights of every individual are not conferred upon him by society, but are a prerogative of his rational nature.

XLIV

The obligation and the right of providing education for the child belong, by natural law, primarily to the parents.

XLV

State monopoly of education abrogates the fundamental rights of the parents as well as those of the Church.

XLVI

The Sacraments of the New Testament are really and truly efficient causes *ex opere operato*, producing their effects independently of the merits and disposition of the recipient.

XLVII

The valid administration of a Sacrament requires on the part of the minister the intention *faciendi quod facit Ecclesia.*

XLVIII

Baptism may be administered either by effusion, immersion or aspersion.

XLIX

For the valid administration of Extreme Unction the recipient must be baptized, dangerously ill, and morally responsible.

L

It may be held as the more probable opinion that the matter of the Sacrament of sacerdotal ordination consists in the second imposition of hands—*manuum extensio;* the accompanying prayer of the bishop constituting the form.

LI

Canones 762-769.

LII

Canones 1060-1062.

LIII

Canones 1063-1065.

LIV

Canones 1095-1096.

LV

Canones 1250-1254.

LVI

Although the precise year of the martyrdom of St. Ignatius of Antioch cannot be determined, the approximate date is probably between 107-110 A. D.

LVII

The distinction between the priesthood and the episcopate, and the superiority of the former over the diaconate, is distinctly set forth in the epistles of St. Ignatius of Antioch.

LVIII

The importance of St. Polycarp of Smyrna as a witness for early ecclesiastical tradition is vouched for by his intimate relations with the Apostle St. John, with his contemporaries, and with his own disciples.

LIX

Although the principles of religious freedom and equality had made progress during the war of the American Revolution, the Constitutions adopted by the several States and the laws passed to regulate the new governments established, show that religious intolerance had not been removed.

LX

Despite the difficulties with which it had to contend, the Catholic Church in the early history of the United States made constant progress both materially and spiritually.

Vidit Sacra Facultas:

Carolus F. Aiken, S. T. D., p. t. Decanus

Henricus Schumacher, S. T. D., p. t. a Secretis

Vidit Rector Universitatis:

✠ Thomas J. Shahan, S. T. D.

BIOGRAPHICAL

ROMUALD ALPHONSE MOLLAUN was born at Oldenburg, Indiana, September 26, 1894. He received his elementary education at Holy Family School, Oldenburg, Indiana, and his classical training at St. Francis Preparatory Seminary, Cincinnati, Ohio, whereupon he entered the Order of Friars Minor, August 15, 1913. After his religious profession he pursued the prescribed courses in philosophy and theology and was ordained to the priesthood June 11, 1920. In the fall of the same year he matriculated at the Catholic University of America and pursued courses in the School of the Sacred Sciences, specializing in New Testament exegesis. He obtained the degrees of S. T. B. and S. T. L. in 1921.

ERRATA

Page 5, line 6, *for* Claramontanus, *read* Claromontanus.

Page 7, line 14, *for* result, *read* results.

Page 23, line 16, *for* moutrer, *read* montrer.

Page 29, line 12, *for* human nature, *read* work amongst men.

Page 31, line 1, *for* perefctly, *read* perfectly.

Page 35, line 35, *for* Indicopleustas, *read* Indicopleustes.

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES

No. I. **The Pauline ΠΙΣΤΙΣ-ΥΠΟΣΤΑΣΙΣ, (Hebr. XI, 1). XI, 1.**

Rev. Michael A. Mathis, C. S. C., S. T. D., Holy Cross College, Brookland, D. C.

No. II. **The Pauline Formula "Induere Christum."**

Rev. Leo J. Ohleyer, O. F. M., S. T. D., 3140 Meramec St., St. Louis, Mo.

No. III. **The Boyhood Consciousness of Christ (Luke II, 49).**

Rev. Patrick J. Temple, S. T. D., The Macmillan Co., New York.

No. IV. **St. Paul's Concept of ΙΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ (Rom. III, 25).**

Rev. Romuald A. Mollaun, O. F. M., S. T. L., 1615 Vine St., Cincinnati, Ohio.

No. V. **The Lord's Command to Baptise (Mt. XXVIII, 19).**

Rev. Bernard H. Cuneo, O. F. M., S. T. L., The Old Mission, Santa Barbara, Calif.